

have asked for maps and historical documents that the BIA considered. Nothing was produced.

I asked for the chain-of-command that was followed and the BIA's interpretation and understanding of the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924 and the actions of the Pueblo Lands Board. Nothing was produced.

I even asked the BIA for information related to mediation services, Mr. Chairman, because the fabric of these communities are being torn apart. That is why I felt compelled to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am happy to work with the gentleman and Ms. MCCOLLUM in a nonpartisan way to address the concerns of your constituents.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member who has also encouraged us to find a way to work together.

I also want to thank Chairman CALVERT and his staff for being accommodating so we can sit down and look at this very important issue that is specific to the State of New Mexico.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I look forward to working with the gentleman and with Chairman CALVERT on this issue.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank everyone. I thank all the staff.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000)(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is related to the previous amendment that I offered. It was something that I uncovered as I was learning more and more about how to solve the egress-ingress issue pursuant to the 1924 Pueblo Lands Act.

Chairman CALVERT, again, with your commitment, and that of Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, if you are able to work with me on this issue, I plan to withdraw this amendment.

This amendment sought to reprogram \$1 million in the Bureau of Indian Affairs funding to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to update and digitize its inventory of rights-of-way records and to make them publicly available in a commonly used mapping format.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has long failed to adequately maintain rights-of-way records, and the Bureau is often unable to provide requested documentation to tribes and other stakeholders in a timely manner.

For example, when my office asked for information related to the rights-of-way in New Mexico, the Bureau of Indian Affairs could not share it with my office in a timely fashion.

And just today, Mr. Chairman, the Pueblo of Zia, a pueblo in the State of New Mexico, provided me documentation that the Pueblo of Zia has asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs for a request of specific rights-of-way information this past February, February 24, 2016, to be exact. It is now July. The Pueblo of Zia tells me that none of this information has been provided to the pueblo.

My argument is this, Mr. Chairman. If this information was made available to the public in a way that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as I understand it, should already be making available, this information should be readily available.

This is simply unacceptable that the information is not being provided, and especially with the trust responsibilities the Bureau of Indian Affairs has with tribes as well. Thankfully, I believe there is a commonsense solution.

In February 2014, the Tribal Transportation Unity Caucus, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Intertribal Transportation Association, jointly developed recommendations for a highway reauthorization, including one to improve the Bureau of Indian Affairs' rights-of-way management.

They suggested requiring the BIA to update and computerize rights-of-way documentation and make them available in a commonly used mapping format. The National Congress of American Indians then passed a resolution endorsing these recommendations in April of 2014. Unfortunately, this commonsense provision didn't make it into the highway bill, which is why I am offering the amendment today.

Too often, the BIA's mismanagement of these records disrupts and slows down projects that are important to tribes and surrounding communities while creating unnecessary conflict.

Mr. Chairman, if we can map the human genome, then surely the BIA can map a few roads, manage its rights-of-way records, and build an accessible, public database to provide certainty to tribes, local governments, and State governments, and other stakeholders.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, I am happy to work with the gentleman and Ms. MCCOLLUM in a nonpartisan way to address these issues, and I look forward to working with him to resolve this for his constituents.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I thank Chairman CALVERT again for his leadership and for his staff again. I appreciate the time to work together. And, again, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, to you and the minority staff, thank you for all that you do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2012) “An Act to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.”, and agrees to the request by the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ranking Member BETTY MCCOLLUM.

We can raise the living standards for working families all over the country right now if we use Federal dollars to create good jobs. The United States Government is the largest buyer of goods and services in the world, and the United States Government should use that power to create good jobs and to create a high-road economy for all Americans.

My amendment would reprogram funds to create an Office of Good Jobs in the Interior Department that would do the following: it would help ensure the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for all Americans to know that more than 1 in 5 Americans are employed by companies with Federal contracts. Right now the U.S. Government is America's leading low-wage job creator.

That is right. The United States Government, at this very hour, funds over 2 million low-paying jobs through contracts, loans, and grants with corporate America. That is why more than the total number—the total number of low-wage workers employed by Walmart and McDonalds combined do not equal the number of low-wage jobs funded by the United States Government.

□ 1800

That is right. Wal-Mart and McDonald's combined have fewer low-wage jobs than are funded by the Federal Government right now. U.S. contract workers earn so little that nearly 40 percent of them use public assistance programs like food stamps and Section 8 to feed and shelter their families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. This Office of Good Jobs would help ensure that the Interior contracting employment decisions encourage the creation of decent paid jobs, implementation of fair labor practices, and responsible employer practices.

The Federal Government should set an example to the Nation when it comes to contracting decisions, and the office will guide Interior to make responsible contracting employment decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is duplicative. It ignores the existing contractor award system that is already in place. Contracting officers must already consult the system for award management to ensure a contractor can be awarded a contract.

Businesses on the excluded parties list system have been suspended or debarred through a due process system and may not be eligible to receive or renew Federal contracts for such cited offenses.

The best way to ensure that the government contracts with or provides grants to the best employers is to enforce the existing suspension and debarment system.

Bad actors who are in violation of the basic worker protections should not be awarded Federal contracts. That is why the Federal Government already has a system in place to deny Federal contracts to bad actors. If a contractor fails to maintain high standards of integrity and business ethics, agencies already have the authority to suspend or debar the employer from government contracting. In 2014, Federal agencies issued more than 1,000 suspensions and nearly 2,000 debarments to employers who bid on Federal contracts.

The amendment would delay the procurement process with harmful consequences. On numerous occasions, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has highlighted costly litigation stemming from complex regulatory rules, including from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This amendment punishes employers who may unknowingly or unwillingly get caught in the Federal Government's maze of bureaucratic rules and reporting requirements. The procurement process is already plagued by delays and inefficiencies.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the gentleman confuses the debarment process, which says that we are going to look at the very worst actors and exclude them and the Office of Good Jobs, which would say that we will use education and we will use prioritization to make sure that the best employers are the ones that the American taxpayer is going to employ in order to award contracts. It is just a simple matter of understanding the difference between excluding the very worst and rewarding the best.

I think that the American people would like to see the Federal Government say: You are a good employer, you pay good wages and good benefits, and we think that that kind of practice is the kind of thing we like to see, and, therefore, our Office of Good Jobs is going to prioritize such businesses.

Time and time again, we hear Members of the party opposite confuse the debarment process with the Office of Good Jobs concept. It is a big difference, and I think that the American people would agree that where we find

the best practices, we should reward them, not simply create a big, big bottle, a big, big vat of the best competing with the mediocre, and then exclude the very, very worst.

I just want to make this point. This is good for good contractors in many ways, because if you are an excellent contractor and you go out of your way to reward good workers and help create a hybrid economy, you are still competing with the people who are doing the bare minimum they can just to avoid debarment. I think that is not fair to good contractors. I think good contractors ought to be rewarded.

I think that if we establish this Office of Good Jobs, what we will see is a general wave throughout our economy as the private sector will look to the Federal Government as to what the best ways to create a fair economy could be, and we would see a greater measure of economic equality and opportunity throughout the land.

I just want to say that if the system we had was adequate, why, then, would we have 40 percent of all people who work for Federal contractors eligible for Federal Government programs, like Section 8 and food stamps? Why would we see that? Well, because we are not prioritizing good jobs. We are just saying that if you are a lawbreaker, you will be excluded, but other than that, we don't really care. An Office of Good Jobs would change that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

It is intended that the appropriation for Departmental Operations in the Office of the Secretary at the United States Interior Department be used to establish an Office of Good Jobs in the Department aimed at ensuring that the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices. The office's structure shall be substantially similar to the Centers for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships located within the Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce, Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Small Business Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and U.S. Agency for International Development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, we have a process in place. I certainly won't support subjective Federal decision-makers deciding who is a good employer and who is a bad employer. As a former employer myself, I know that most employers in this country are good people who want to make sure that people have good jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,060,000)”.

Page 40, line 7, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,060,000)”.

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$13,060,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, my simple amendment would add \$13 million to the Hazardous Substance Superfund to equal the level requested by the EPA.

Superfund cleanup is the right thing for the environment, right for the economy, and certainly right for public health.

I am from the Garden State. We are known across the country for having the best tomatoes, corn, blueberries, and cranberries we grow. But in south Jersey, we have a history as a cornerstone of heavy industry. New Jersey found out the hard way what you can and what you can't dump into the lakes, backyards, and other facilities.

Then companies left, leaving our constituents holding the bag. Representative Jim Florio, who held my seat from 1975 to 1990, saw these very issues in south Jersey and across the country. That is why he authored the Superfund legislation back in 1980. Almost four decades later, the list of Superfund sites is still overflowing. There are well over 1,000 contaminated sites across the country, and I have 13 in my district alone.

In 2015, the GAO studied the progress of the Superfund program. The report found that, in real dollars, appropriations to the EPA Superfund program declined almost \$1 billion from 1999 to 2013.

Congress has funded less than 40 percent of shovel-ready cleanup projects. The EPA is often forced to prioritize one seriously contaminated site over another, leaving those other sites to be contaminated, in some cases, up to 50 years.

This amendment would help the EPA clean up more contaminated materials in their parks, backyards, and commercial properties sooner rather than later.

Mr. Chairman, later the House will consider another amendment of mine that would designate an additional \$15 million within the Superfund account, specifically for the enforcement division.

Not only do we consistently underfund Superfund cleanup activities, we have even underfunded the EPA office that is supposed to go after those polluters who have been found guilty of dumping and polluting our environment.

As I mentioned earlier, in my district alone, I have over 13 sites that lay contaminated today. I just briefly want to tell you about three of them. The sites are named after the company that was accused and has been found liable, that is the Sherwin-Williams site. These sites include the Sherwin-Williams/Hilliard's Creek site located in Gibbsboro, the Route 561 Dump Site in Gibbsboro, and United States Avenue Burn Site in Gibbsboro. Those other sites include part of Voorhees also.

Back in the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams opened a paint factory. For 20 years, they dangerously dumped these chemicals that were related to their synthetic varnish to be produced and dumped in around the Gibbsboro and Voorhees area.

These toxic chemicals from the varnish seeped into the groundwater, contaminating not only the commercial properties, but the streams, lakes, and homes for miles around. After the devastating events of Flint, Michigan, I know I don't have to tell you about the horrific effects of lead exposure on children's developmental issues and pregnant women. According to the EPA, long-term exposure to high levels of arsenic can lead to cancers like skin cancer, bladder cancer, and lung cancer.

This is why my constituents and, quite frankly, all Americans across the country are faced with this decision. They need relief today—not in a few years from now. We must hold companies like Sherwin-Williams accountable for the havoc that they have wreaked in communities like Gibbsboro and Voorhees. We owe it to our constituents to do everything in our power to protect their health.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the intent of the gentleman's amendment to increase funding for the Superfund, something that we all support, it is important that Members understand two things: First, top line funding for the Superfund is already increased in the bill by \$27 million from the FY16 enacted level.

Second, the gentleman proposes to reduce funding for the Payments in

Lieu of Taxes, PILT, program which is critical to counties and local governments in 49 States, including New Jersey, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories. PILT is fully funded in this bill. It is a program supported by a large, bipartisan majority in the House. A reduction in the PILT funding would have a detrimental effect on counties and local governments across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is about protecting public health from designated sites that have been contaminated for literally decades.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 67, strike lines 4 through 19.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strips the language that would block the implementation of the Stream Protection Rule.

We should not willfully delay or stop this rule. I am very familiar with mountaintop removal mining. When I was Lieutenant Governor of Virginia in the 1990s, mountaintop removal mining became the most prevalent coal mining technique in central Appalachia. I made more than 100 trips to Virginia's coalfields, and I know firsthand the negative impact mountaintop removal has had on the environment and on the health of these communities.

If we know of reasonable ways to mitigate negative effects, we should be doing everything in our power to implement them. That is why the Stream Protection Rule is so important.

During mountaintop removal, tens of thousands of cubic feet of mountaintops are blown off with explosives and

pushed over the sides, filling mountain valleys with enormous waste piles.

□ 1815

These valley fills, as they are called, bury headwater streams and everything else that once populated the valley. Already, mountaintop removal mining has flattened more than 500,000 acres of forested land and permanently buried over 2,000 miles of streams, destroying sources that feed our water.

Emerging science has documented a dramatic decline in the diversity, the abundance, and the biomass of fish in streams with pollution that results from mining. It is the coal industry that asked the government to clearly define the expectations for environmental protection, and that is what this rule does. By introducing verified scientific methods and testing, the government provides regulatory certainty and achieves the environmental protection that is required by law.

Without this rule, stream destruction continues to occur and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement will remain vulnerable to more legal challenges. Local citizens will be forced to resort to the courts instead of having their government act to protect their welfare.

The stream protection rule is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the different regions where coal is mined. It is very different in Wyoming than it is in southwest Virginia. The rule is designed to prevent water pollution due to coal mining using current scientific understanding. It is designed to protect our families while protecting jobs. In fact, the Office of Surface Mining's analysis shows this rule will have minimal impact on coal companies and minimal job loss. The estimate is 10 lost jobs—10.

We have seen how necessary this rule is in Virginia. Water monitoring found that Kelly Branch Mine in Wise County dumped the toxic pollutant selenium into streams at levels way above State water quality standards and without a permit to allow such pollution. As a result of a citizen suit, Southern Coal Corporation has since agreed to perform environmental cleanup projects and pay penalties and attorney fees for these pollution violations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't need lawsuits. This violation shouldn't happen in the first place. Now is the time to give the people of Appalachia and others around the country protections for their waterways that were promised to them by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in 2008, the Office of Surface Mining finalized revisions to the stream zone buffer rule in an open and transparent man-

ner. After taking office, the Obama administration put on hold that rule and proposed a different rule last year without the input of the States.

The administration's approach under the new rule has been anything but collaborative and inclusive, and States have been totally shut out of the process. In response, the FY16 omnibus includes language to bring the States and the administration back together. To date, OSM has not shared all documents with the States and refuses to meet with the States that have requested meetings.

The American people expect more—more openness and transparency from their government—and that is why this funding prohibition must remain in the base bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” and reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The amendment would allow OMS to deal with the continuing problems posed by mountaintop mining removal because this practice contaminates, destroys streams, and negatively impacts human health. Two lawsuits challenge this Bush-era rule, and in February 2014, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia vacated a 2008 stream buffer rule.

It is important that we allow this to move forward, and I am going to simply state why.

In a study in 2011, it found that counties near mountaintop mining areas had higher rates for five out of six types of birth defects, including circulatory, respiratory, skeletomuscular, central nervous system, gastrointestinal, and I could go on and on. Clearly, we know that the health effects from mountaintop mining-related air and water contamination is cumulative and is dangerous to public health.

OSM must be allowed to go forward with this water protection rule to guarantee the public an opportunity to live a healthy life.

I urge my colleagues to support the Beyer amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the subcommittee chairman, I was at the hearing all morning at Natural Resources a few months ago when we had the Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement on this exact issue. He deeply resisted the idea, what he called, I think it was, the fix or the myth that we weren't working closely with the States.

I completely agree with the subcommittee chairman that the Office of

Surface Mining should work very closely with the States to develop this rule and, in fact, insisted that they had from the beginning of the Obama administration, picking up on what the Bush administration had done, right through today. I agree that this is appropriate, but I resist the wisdom of the truth that the States have been shut out of the process.

One more small point, but a really important point. A 2009 report on the NIH Web site estimated that coal mining cost Appalachia five times more in premature deaths—\$42 billion—than it provided the region in all jobs, taxes, and other economic benefits from coal mining—just \$8 billion.

We are not trying to get rid of coal. There is no war on coal. We just want to make sure that the people who are doing the work who live there are protected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a critically important issue—the prohibition that is contained in this bill—relating to this incredible overreach of the regulatory authority from this administration.

The stream buffer zone rule is similar in character to so many of the efforts of this administration to empower the EPA and, in this case, the Office of Surface Mining to do things that are without legal basis and authority under the law. What is very important about this provision in this bill is saying no to this administration, no, once again, to a regulatory overreach that is not founded in basis of law.

I strongly urge the rejection of this amendment so we maintain the language that is contained in the Interior appropriations bill saying no to this administration's overreach of the rules and regulations. I suggest and encourage a rejection of this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New

Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), I offer amendment No. 11.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, strike lines 3 through 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes section 122 from the underlying bill. That section would prevent the BLM from meeting its statutory obligations under the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure operators "use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas."

The BLM would also be prevented, if this underlying provision remains, from modernizing the existing 30-year-old oil and gas production rules to bring them into line with technological advancements in the industry. If that provision stays in the bill, States, tribes, and Federal taxpayers stand to lose royalty revenues when natural gas is wasted, which a 2010 GAO report estimated could amount to as much as \$23 million, annually, in royalty revenue.

If this provision remains in the bill, BLM will not be able to update the current royalty rate or raise it as conditions may warrant. A recommendation has been made by both the GAO and the inspector general that they do that, that the conditions do indicate that an increase is in order.

So it is just good government to take this provision out, to update a 30-year-old set of regulations in order to better reflect the current operating climate and to ensure a fair royalty return.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the bill includes section 122 because the Bureau of Land Management does not have the authority to regulate methane emissions. Congress has given that authority to the Environmental Protection Agency. BLM's proposed regulation is just another part of the administration's overly aggressive regulatory agenda and overly broad interpretation of current law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Can you imagine a 30-year-old oil and gas production rule and not being able to update it? This amendment allows a 30-year-old rule to comply with today's

technology to make sure that we are doing what is best practices in the industry and we can work with the industry to do proper oversight.

As was pointed out, if this provision stays in place, States, tribes, and Federal taxpayers would lose royalty revenues. We should be doing everything we can with our public lands to make sure the taxpayer receives full value whenever there is a lease.

I support this amendment, and I urge for its adoption.

Just once again, imagine not being able to update 30-year-old rules and not being able to update current royalty rates. We need to do better by the American taxpayer; we need to strike this provision; we need to do the updates; we need to update 30-year-old regulations; and we need to make sure that the American taxpayer gets a fair return on its royalties.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 69, beginning at line 3, strike section 124.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment ensures that we keep the appropriate safety regulations in place for offshore oil drilling to reduce the risk of an offshore oil disaster and the devastating impacts on our economy and environment.

The Deepwater Horizon blowout of 2010 is still very fresh in our minds. I represent a Gulf Coast district in Florida, in Tampa Bay, and I remember very well the 87 days that oil spewed out of that Deepwater well, the 11 lives lost, and the huge economic losses.

One study said that, in Florida, we lost 50,000 jobs because of that blowout,

not to mention the environmental catastrophe that it was, that we are still trying to determine the long-term impacts.

□ 1830

For 87 days, the well continued to pump 134 million gallons of toxic oil before it could be stopped. This tarred fisheries, wildlife, and fragile ecosystems. I will always remember the motel owner from Pinellas County who cried because all of her business had evaporated. We didn't even have oil on the Gulf Coast beaches around Tampa Bay, but all of the tourists left. Our lifeblood in Florida is the tourism industry and the fishing industry.

This is really inexplicable after years of working with industry, after congressional hearings to determine the causes of that disaster, after numerous investigative reports, including the bipartisan National Oil Spill Commission, led by former Florida Governor and Senator Bob Graham, and Republican and former EPA Administrator William Riley, where they zeroed in on the fact that it was the well casing and the blow-out preventer that was the source of the problem. Based upon all of those findings and investigations, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement developed its final Well Control Rule, which focuses on the blow-out preventer and well control requirements, because this is America, and we can develop state-of-the-art technology for risky oil drilling no matter where it is occurring.

The final rule was developed after unprecedented outreach and consultation with industry and other stakeholders. It addresses the full range of systems and equipment that are related to well control operations, with a focus on blow-out preventer requirements, well design, well control casings, cementing, real-time monitoring, and subsea containment. These measures are designed to improve equipment reliability, especially for blow-out preventers. The most important thing is they protect our communities. They protect us from a disaster like the BP Deepwater Horizon from ever happening again.

It is really inexplicable that the Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee zeroed in on this safety rule in this appropriations bill and said we are not going to support it, that we are not going to fund it for this year. What is that going to do? Industry already supports most of these things. They don't want to be on the hook for billions and billions of dollars. It is just, clearly, inexplicable to put our communities at risk again for another disaster like that.

The Castor amendment eliminates this harmful provision, and it maintains the Department of the Interior's critical safety standards to prevent offshore oil disasters. The Gulf Coast is still reeling from the disaster of 2010, and local economies across the country cannot afford another catastrophe like

BP's. I urge the adoption of the Castor amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, investigations were conducted by industry experts, and they determined the actual causes of the catastrophe of the Deepwater Horizon. Many of the requirements of this rule are not new, and they already exist in industry standards.

This rule has one goal for me, and that is to save lives. Eleven lives were lost in that explosion. We have learned from that event. It was a tragic event what happened with the Deepwater Horizon. We should do everything we can to put workers' safety ahead of Big Oil's profits.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, at various hearings throughout the year, Chairman CALVERT expressed concern that the administration was taking a page out of its "war on coal" playbook and applying it to oil production.

The Department of the Interior has been attempting to make it as costly as possible to operate offshore so that companies will make the decision not to apply for a permit. They took that a step further last week with its Arctic regulations. In this instance, the Department set onerous requirements under the Well Control Rule that mandated that all wells should have the same thickness regardless of where you are drilling. Now, any engineer will tell you that these are site-specific decisions that are based on many factors and that the thickness will vary, depending on where the well is drilled.

Instead, the White House wants to lock in that decision from Washington, D.C. and ignore recommendations from technical experts. The result is an Obama administration de facto moratorium on oil production as part of the White House's "keep it in the ground" strategy. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if you support the tourism industry, if you support the jobs in the fishing industry, if you support just saving lives, and being able to prevent disasters like the BP Deepwater Horizon from ever happening again, it is important that you stand up for these very basic, industry supported safety standards. The well rule was developed after months and years of investigations and study with stakeholder help.

The bottom line is we have to do everything we can to prevent this from ever happening again in order to protect our economy, to protect our jobs, to protect our natural environment; so I urge the adoption of the Castor amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 70, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 71, line 18.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my colleague from Florida brought up the Deepwater Horizon tragedy because it was 6 years ago this week, actually, after 87 terrible days of the worst oil spill in history, that the BP Deepwater Horizon's wellhead was finally capped. The toll of that disaster, as everyone knows, was horrific—11 workers killed, untold economic damage to communities around the Gulf of Mexico, and, of course, devastating and ongoing impacts on fish and wildlife.

This is a good time for us to reflect and to discuss the role of the Federal Government in reviewing the environmental impacts of oil and gas development, not just in the Gulf of Mexico, but in a place where the environmental damage could be even worse if and when something went wrong, say, in the Arctic Ocean.

My amendment would strike section 127 of the underlying bill. Doing that would allow the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to move forward with its proposed update of regulation on air quality control reporting and compliance. It would allow that proposed rule to serve its intended purpose, which is to bring decades-old rules on offshore air emissions into the 21st century.

The BOEM, itself, is a new agency. It was born out of the response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill, but it was also born out of an awareness that the old agency—the Minerals Management Service—was, frankly, too cozy with Big Oil, and that that is why that old

agency never updated these old rules. These existing air pollution rules have been in place since 1988, and it is past time that we moved forward with new pollution standards, new modeling, and new technology.

The proposed rule, in this case, seeks to address the emissions of several very harmful air pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. The proposed rule does that with flexibility. Actually, in some cases, it reduces regulatory burdens by eliminating redundant reporting requirements and by allowing operators to use emissions credits.

The residents of the Arctic and other oil-producing regions and the workers in the industry shouldn't be subjected to additional air pollution from oil and gas development simply because of where they live and work. We should let these new rules go forward. If history teaches us anything, it teaches us that Big Oil cannot be trusted to do the right thing when it is left unregulated. I would hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree that strong and consistent oversight is necessary. I ask for a "yes" vote.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the administration has started the process to promulgate new air quality regulations for offshore operations with the intention of finalizing them by year's end; however, key studies are currently underway that will not be finished until sometime next year, in 2017. The administration wants to finalize these rules before these key studies are done.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has allocated nearly \$4 million for the studies to determine if there are any impacts to a State's air quality from offshore operations. Section 127 of this bill instructs the Department to wait until these studies are finalized and to restart only if the findings indicate there is a need for rulemaking.

This is one of those cases in which we say let the science be the science, and let's find out what the studies say before we make final decisions on this. There is a regulatory process which should be followed, and there is a scientific process that should be followed. That is coming from a Republican. The administration cannot circumvent one for the expediency of the other; so I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it always warms my heart to hear my Republican colleagues embrace science. It is a beautiful thing. I wish it happened a lot more often.

In this case, we have had 30 years of study. We know a lot. The administration has developed this rule to the

point at which it believes it is ready. It is an important rule; it is long overdue; and it is time to move forward. I continue to request a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment and to let the process go through and the studies and to find out what the studies say. Let's follow the science. I urge my colleagues to follow that and to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, line 11, after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$88,282,000)".

Page 184, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$88,282,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under the Obama administration, we have seen an explosion of new regulations that have impacted every area of our lives. From the way we heat our homes in the winter to the way that we choose our health care, this administration knows no bounds in its regulatory overreach.

The EPA leads the way on this front. According to a report that was released by the American Action Forum, the EPA now imposes nearly 200 million hours of paperwork to comply with its regulations. This is the equivalent of 95,000 Americans working full-time for a year. This represents an astonishing 23 percent increase from 2009 and a 34 percent increase since 2002 in the EPA's paperwork burden.

New regulations, such as the Clean Power Plan, waters of the United States, and the ozone rule, all contribute to this growing burden. Yet, this burden isn't limited to just the act of doing paperwork. These regulations raise the price of energy, cost Missourians jobs, and hurt their bottom lines. The EPA uses the Air, Climate and En-

ergy, ACE, program to advance research and regulations that are geared toward a climate change agenda. Regulations to address climate change are costing Americans billions with there being very little actual impact on global temperatures to show for it. The result of ACE research furthers regulations, which burden our Nation's energy sector and communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and cut the ACE program and leave us with one less program to advance the regulatory overreach of this administration's and save taxpayer dollars.

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

□ 1845

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would eliminate the funding for the EPA Air, Climate, and Energy research program. I think we all know that the Clean Air Act has resulted in one of the most effective public health programs in American history by addressing air quality in the United States.

What this amendment would do would be to set back any advances in new technology and new scientific tools that would help protect the American public from harmful exposure to air pollutants which, as we know, can damage our health, causing lung and heart disease, impact our immune, nervous, and reproductive systems, and shorten our lives.

Millions of people in America live in counties that do not meet air quality standards for one or more pollutants, and new threats from climate change expand the air quality challenges confronting our society.

The energy choices we make clearly influence air quality and climate change. Eliminating EPA funding to research and understand the impacts on air quality from alternative energy sources is, at a minimum, shortsighted.

The bill already reduces the EPA by \$164 million from the FY 2016 enacted level. I think we have already done enough damage in that particular reduction.

For the health and welfare of our citizens, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), I offer amendment No. 15.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,000,000)".

Page 74, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,038,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment transfers approximately \$10 million to the EPA's Office of Inspector General from the \$2.5 billion EPA environmental programs and management appropriations account. The amendment is necessary to support the EPA OIG's work related to preventing waste, fraud, and abuse, and identifying inefficiencies and potential cost savings at the EPA.

The EPA Office of Inspector General has faced significant funding challenges in recent years. Its full-time employees dropped from 349 to 289, a decrease of almost one-fifth of the office's workforce.

Despite significant resource challenges, the Office of Inspector General at EPA continued to conduct important investigations and audits that saved money for taxpayers and revealed misconduct and abuses at the agency. During FY14, EPA OIG reported \$380 million in savings, which is a \$7.35 return on investment for every dollar in the OIG budget. The EPA's Office of Inspector General identified \$4.1 million in savings during the most recent semiannual reporting period.

The EPA OIG has also investigated gross misconduct and abuses at EPA that yielded savings for taxpayers. For instance, in 2013, the office conducted a criminal investigation into former EPA employee John Beale, who was found to have stolen government money and engaged in travel voucher fraud and time and attendance fraud. Beale committed these frauds by masquerading as an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency. Beale agreed to pay restitution of \$890,000 to EPA and \$500,000 to the Department of Justice. Beale was also sentenced to 32 months in prison.

The EPA Office of Inspector General also investigated allegations of gross

mismanagement at the Chemical Safety Board in 2012 and found hostility toward whistleblowers and a toxic, ineffective work environment undermined by the board's chemical accident investigations. The EPA OIG's investigation and pressure from Congress caused the President to remove the CSB chairman.

I want you to know that as the subcommittee chairman on our committee, that we have looked at the EPA and we have taken the Inspector General's reports and we have used them to make considerable changes that have increased morale, especially at the Chemical Safety Board; and that we have also saved taxpayer dollars because we have utilized the Office of Inspector General reports. They have shed light on a litany of other employee misconduct. This is a good investment of taxpayer dollars.

This amendment ensures that EPA OIG will have the resources it needs to continue to conduct these essential investigations. So the amendment increases funding for the EPA OIG by \$10,038,000. It decreases EPA environmental programs and management appropriations by \$14 million. That is actually awash when you look at the out years.

I strongly encourage adoption of the Chaffetz amendment to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, with gratitude for your time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few points about this amendment. As my colleague has said, this would reduce the funds from EPA operations by \$14 million and increase the Inspector General by \$10 million. I think we would certainly agree that it would be a good idea to increase the funding for the Inspector General, and we would like to see the other side increase those funds.

But we are uncomfortable with the idea of taking the funding from the operating account. This account has already been cut by \$92 million, and it would reduce the operating account by \$14 million, putting that money over there. This seems like too severe of a cut on top of what has already been done.

We don't disagree that the work of the Inspectors General across all agencies in Federal Government are necessary and very important and they do good work.

So, once again, I just oppose the shift in funding. I think it would be great if the other side wanted to enhance the funding for the Office of Inspector General, just not through this mechanism.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000)".

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$70,000,000)".

Page 96, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$70,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment that redirects funds from EPA bureaucracy to the Forest Services' hazardous fuels account in order to prevent dangerous wildfires.

In 2015, over 10 million acres burned throughout the country, setting a new record. In that same year, fire season appropriations requests were approximately \$4 billion for all wildfire programs. Shamefully, the President requested only \$356 million of those funds go toward hazardous fuels reduction activities.

Thinning overgrown forests and removing hazardous fuels creates jobs and increases overall forest health. Unfortunately, extremist self-interest groups and Washington bureaucrats have failed to recognize this correlation. As a result, timber harvests are down 80 percent over the last 30 years.

Such flawed thinking also negatively impacts education and local communities. Historically, 25 percent of the receipts from timber harvests by the Federal Government go toward schools and important infrastructure projects.

The failure to prioritize hazardous fuels reduction activities is also bad for our environment, as sound data from NASA concludes that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total emissions in an entire State over the course of a year.

As it currently stands, the Forest Service consistently raids its own treasury when firefighting costs exceed their estimated yearly allotment, taking money from programs that clear brush and remove dead trees. This represents yet another classic example of Washington's misguided prioritization of Federal funds.

The Forest Service's own Fuel Treatment Effective Database reports that "over 90 percent of the fuel treatments were effective in changing fire behavior and/or helping with control of the wildfire."

Hazardous fuels reduction activities work. In eastern Arizona, areas that

were treated in the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest as part of the White Mountain Stewardship Project help prevent further destruction from the catastrophic Wallow Fire.

Today there are still healthy trees as firefighters were able to control previously thinned areas. On other lands that were untouched by thinning practices and managed by the Forest Service, all that is left behind is scorched earth and sterilized soil.

It is of the utmost urgency that the Federal Government adopt a forward-thinking, active management strategy that combats dangerous wildfires before they get started. My amendment helps accomplish that task by redirecting scarce resources to important hazardous fuels reduction activities.

I am honored that this amendment is supported by the Americans for Limited Government, Public Lands Council, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Agribusiness & Water Council of Arizona, Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, New Mexico Wool Growers, New Mexico Federal Lands Council, Yavapai County Cattle Growers' Association, Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, and countless other organizations and individuals in my home State of Arizona.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their good work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I have to strongly oppose this amendment that would take even more money from the already starved EPA. The bill has already severely cut the Environmental Protection Agency's main operating account by \$92 million. This would cut it by another \$70 million. And so far tonight, we have agreed to another \$29 million through amendments.

The very air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by the funding and the policy decisions that are already made in this bill. Their consequences will be felt negatively in communities across this country.

I know it is often an easy target for my colleagues across the aisle to cut the EPA, but I do want my colleagues to understand what this amendment would mean if this cut was adopted.

The account funds programs that are important to both sides of the aisle, including permitting for construction projects across the country; toxics; risk prevention; part of the successful brownfields program; pesticides licensing, which, as we know, is a critical part of fighting the Zika crisis.

In my opinion, this very large cut would be irresponsible, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I believe that the Forest Service needs to be more proactive in managing our national forests. The latest estimates show that there are nearly 66 million dead and dying trees in California right now. This sets the stage for what could be a disastrous fire seed. We simply must get ahead of this situation. This is why we provided significant increases for hazardous fuel and management programs in this bill, but certainly we would support any additional help.

I would move to adopt this very important amendment.

□ 1900

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, while the bill does include nearly \$2.9 billion for wildfire activities, which I am thankful for, most of these dollars are focused on suppression activities.

As I stated previously, the 2015 fire season set a new record, burning more than 10 million acres throughout the country. It is easy to make that statement when it is not your home burning. Clearly, we must focus on proactive solutions for our Nation's forests.

The best way to do so is by providing the Forest Service hazardous fuel account with appropriate funding in order to prevent hazardous wildfires. My amendment accomplishes that task by redirecting scarce resources from the EPA's bureaucracy.

The EPA is far from being underfunded. As it stands, this bill currently funds the EPA at over \$7.98 billion. This marginal loss to a rogue administration that continues to circumvent Congress in order to implement lawless regulations is better spent through my amendment and will dramatically increase the Forest Service's ability to prevent dangerous wildfires. Again, I urge the support of my amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I just want to reiterate again, this bill has already severely cut the EPA's main operating account by \$92 million. Already tonight, amendments have cut it another \$29 million. This agency is fundamental. The protection that they do is critical. This account funds programs that are important to us on both sides of the aisle.

No one disagrees that it is important to fund the disastrous wildfires that have taken over in our country, and we very much understand those challenges, but this amendment is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 90, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for allowing me the opportunity to offer this important amendment.

I rise today in support of my amendment. My amendment is simple. It removes \$12 million from the EPA's environmental programs and management account and places \$10 million into the U.S. Forest Service's forest and rangeland research account, which funds important scientific research through the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program and the Forest Products Laboratory. This will free up money from the Federal bureaucracy for use in on-the-ground scientific research into forest health, wood products, biomass, and threatened species.

To make sound forest management decisions, it is imperative to quantify the amount of standing timber, the harvest and usage rates, how much is lost to insects and disease infestation, how many trees are lost to wildfire, and how much net growth occurs in our forest. The Forest Inventory and Analysis Program does just that.

The data is used to assess the quantity and quality of our forestlands, both public and private. It lets us know if we are gaining or losing forestland, and it tells us if we have a net loss or net gain in trees and tree volume. This data is critical to calculate how much carbon storage we have in our forest, and without this data, we cannot understand our total carbon balance.

The Forest Service often finds itself on extended sampling periods, sometimes as many as 6 or 7 years, leading to delayed analysis of our Nation's forest landscape. This forces States to increase their matching contributions in order to have sound, timely scientific data for statewide forest management plans.

FIA takes proactive, positive steps in the area of better forest management. FIA leads to scientific forest management practices that increase carbon storage and reduce the threat to wildfire. Additional funding to FIA will also give wood products and timber in-

dustries certainty in making business decisions. Forestry employs approximately 2.8 million people nationwide, and this is larger than the automotive industry.

The forest and rangeland research account also funds the Forest Products Laboratory. The Forest Products Laboratory conducts significant scientific research into wood products, forest biomass, the use of wood in tall buildings and threats to various species, such as white-nose syndrome. This amendment is a win-win for a healthy environment and scientific research.

Madam Chair, I again want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for the opportunity to offer this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I just want to make a point.

I appreciate the gentleman's interest in forestry issues and his support for changing the way we budget for catastrophic wildland fires. An increase in the Forest Service's research capability will help address our forest management issues. I support the amendment, and I certainly urge its adoption.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, again, I must oppose this amendment because it continues to take more money from the already-starved EPA. The EPA's main operating account was cut by \$92 million in the bill. With the last amendment that just passed, we have cut another \$99 million tonight from the EPA account.

We are not arguing that funding for forest and rangeland research is a poor purpose, but it was fully funded in the budget, and it is starting to feel a little bit like we are just seeing amendment after amendment that is a way to starve the EPA.

The EPA is a critical agency. The very air that we breathe, the water that we drink are endangered by the funding and policy decisions that are being made in this bill. The consequences will be felt negatively in communities across the country.

I just cannot support taking money from an underfunded agency and putting it into a program that is already receiving an increase in this bill, so I oppose the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, healthy forests are critical to clean air, clean water, better wildlife habitat, better recreation opportunities, and more biodiversity. This amendment will promote healthy forests, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, we certainly support healthy forests. I represent the State of Maine, where we have a tremendous amount of forests and many people who work in the forest products industry, so we respect the value of this research. But it was fully funded in the budget, and this is just another cut to the EPA and will take away from the work that they are able to do to protect our clean air and clean water. I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON
OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 17, insert “, consistent with Executive Order 12898,” after “implementation”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, power companies are closing coal-fired power plants as we move toward cleaner, more sustainable ways to generate electricity. A material known as coal ash is a byproduct of this industry. Coal ash contains carcinogens, known carcinogens, such as arsenic, lead, and mercury.

The EPA is now regulating coal ash with its final rule on the disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities. Many of the neighborhoods already exposed to dangerous levels of coal ash are in predominantly low-income and minority communities.

The problem of low-income and minority communities being disproportionately exposed to chemicals, hazardous waste, and toxic materials is neither new nor confined to one area of the country. More than 134 million Americans—their homes, schools, businesses, parks, and places of worship—are in harm's way from dangerous exposure to coal ash.

A 2014 study found that residents in vulnerable zones are disproportionately African American or Latino, have higher rates of poverty than the U.S. as a whole, and have lower housing values, incomes, and education levels. The poverty rate in these zones is 50 percent higher than the national average. The percentage of Blacks is 75 percent greater than for the U.S. as a whole,

while the percentage of Latinos is 60 percent greater. This means that almost half of the people more likely to suffer from exposure are Black or Latino.

But make no mistake, Madam Chair, coal ash poisoning is not racially discriminatory. Rural White communities throughout north Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Oklahoma are suffering from exposure to coal ash dumping, leaking coal ash ponds, and coal ash dust from coal ash transport. We cannot allow people across the country to fall between the regulatory cracks simply because they live in a certain neighborhood or have certain income levels.

This amendment requires implementation of the EPA's coal ash rule to be consistent with Executive Order No. 12898. That executive order's purpose was to focus Federal attention on the environmental and public health effects that Federal regulations have on minority and low-income communities.

More coal ash is expected to be dumped in the State of Georgia. In Jesup, Georgia, a landfill has agreed to accept over 10,000 tons of coal ash per day. Duke Energy is moving their coal ash from North Carolina to a landfill in Banks County, Georgia. Elsewhere within Georgia, communities have been exposed to contaminated drinking water by existing coal ash facilities. Last month, arsenic, beryllium, and selenium were found in the groundwater of various coal ash sites in the State.

As we saw in Flint, we need to act at the Federal level before our failure to do so results in irreversible damage to the health and to the environment of the communities we represent. American families, regardless of income level, should not be unfairly and unreasonably exposed to toxic chemicals.

I ask for support for my amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, because the gentleman's amendment restates current law and nothing more, I am more than willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 83, line 6, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, my amendment would increase funding by \$10 million to match the President's budget request for the State and Tribal Assistance Grants to clean up and revitalize brownfields.

Too many cities and towns across America with proud manufacturing legacies are now struggling with vacant brownfield properties. As our country transitioned away from manufacturing, plants and mills began to close, leaving too many communities to deal with these industrial sites on their own.

These former industrial sites have come to be known as brownfields, land where the presence or potential presence of contamination prevents expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of the land. Brownfield sites aren't limited to abandoned factories or buildings. They can also be former dry cleaning establishments or gas stations that are no longer in use. Every single congressional district in our Nation has at least one brownfield site, and some, in fact, have hundreds.

In April, I was in Torrington, Connecticut, a former mill town in my district where, like many communities in the Naugatuck River Valley, there are brownfields scattered throughout the city. I met with Mayor Carbone and other city and local officials to learn about plans to clean up and repurpose two industrial sites, which would create jobs and revitalize the downtown area.

□ 1915

The plan to revitalize downtown Torrington was made possible by funding provided through the EPA's brownfields grant program. However, to implement Torrington's transformative plan, we need additional funding in the brownfields program.

I think it is important to note that addressing brownfields is not simply an issue for our cities. Expanding funding for brownfields helps not only our cities, but also our suburbs and agricultural communities. Cleaning up and putting brownfields back into economic use in our cities helps preserve open space and surrounding communities by taking pressure off of demand for virgin or undeveloped land.

Additionally, taxpayer dollars go a long way in the brownfields program. For every dollar expended by the EPA's brownfields program, it leverages, on average, approximately \$18 in additional public and private investment and, in many cases, property values have more than doubled when communities were given the resources necessary to repurpose brownfield sites.

According to a 2007 study, approximately 10 jobs are created for every acre of brownfields redevelopment, and with over 400,000 brownfields sites across the country, the work needed to clean up these sites is far from complete.

So let's do our job as elected officials by empowering our constituents with additional funding to clean up contaminated properties, attract new businesses, create jobs, safeguard public health, and revitalize our downtowns.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Esty amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I certainly understand the value of EPA's brownfields program. It is highly leveraged and promotes economic development in communities by cleaning up lightly contaminated properties and returning them to beneficial use. These are good things, no doubt about it. That is why the FY 2017 Interior bill continues to provide the brownfields program with \$80 million. That is equal to the enacted level.

With limited resources, we need to be strategic about where we provide increases. The FY 2017 bill increases funding to clean up most toxic contaminated Superfund sites across the Nation.

We will debate some Democratic amendments that seek to increase the Superfund account beyond what we have done in the bill in order to match the President's request. Certainly, no one wants to live next to a Superfund site. We have more than 1,300 sites on the Superfund list. These sites contain lead, arsenic, cadmium, PCBs, and other highly toxic chemicals. We need to make progress on these 1,300 sites.

So, I must oppose the proposed cut to the Superfund and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, again, with all due respect, I think, as my colleague has noted, these dollars make an enormous impact, and I would respectfully request and urge my colleagues to support the Esty amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 84, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 184, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chair, I commend the gentleman from California for his and his colleagues' work on this bill.

Madam Chair, my amendment would eliminate funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act grant program, saving taxpayers \$100 million. Funds from this program have gone to a number of questionable items, including \$750,000 for cherry pickers in Utah, \$1 million for electrified parking spaces at a truck stop in Delaware, and \$1.2 for a new engine and generators for a 1950s locomotive in Pennsylvania.

This program was intended to be a short-term effort to assist States and local governments in meeting diesel emissions standards, but has joined a long list of temporary government programs for which there is no end in sight.

As Ronald Reagan famously said that, "The nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this Earth is a government program."

One of the things I have learned as a freshman Member of Congress is that we have an office tasked with holding Federal agencies accountable and reporting on their programs. That office is the Government Accountability Office. One of the things that has surprised me is how rarely we act on their recommendations. I hope that won't be the case with this program.

The GAO has noted that funding to reduce diesel emissions is fragmented across 14 programs at the Department of Energy, the Department of Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Surely we can make do with one less.

The \$100 million provided in this bill represents an increase of 100 percent compared to last year's bill and an increase of 100 percent compared to the omnibus bill passed in December.

With a national debt exceeding \$19 trillion, and growing every day, we cannot afford to double the budget of a program that clearly duplicates, at least in part, 13 other programs, and has a marginal impact at best.

The program was originally authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and was reauthorized for 5 years in 2010. This authorization expired in fiscal year 2016, making any appropriation an unauthorized one.

Congress should not provide \$100 million for a wasteful and unauthorized

program, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, Ronald Reagan was mentioned in discussing the gentleman's amendment.

Ronald Reagan signed into law CalEPA in the State of California. He also signed into law the first air quality district to regulate air in the United States, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, in the State of California, which was authored by a former colleague of ours named Jerry Lewis.

Clean air is not a political or partisan issue. Certainly, in my area, which has some of the dirtiest air in the United States, we have done a lot to clean up air in our area in California.

We have included a great number of policy provisions to address EPA's regulatory overreach, which I agree with, in this bill. And we have cut the EPA's budget dramatically, which I am in favor of doing. However, I believe that this specific amendment targets a program that is yielding great benefits. When you have a program that is actually working, we ought to keep it.

Many counties across the Nation are currently not in containment with EPA's existing standards for particulate matter and ozone. In many instances, these counties have been in non-containment for years, and those communities need help to improve their air quality.

The Diesel Emission Reduction Act grant program, DERA, is a proven, cost-effective program that provides grants to States to retrofit old diesel engines. So it is a program that supports manufacturing jobs, while also reducing pollution significantly.

Another benefit is these grants are highly leveraged, producing \$13 of economic benefit for every Federal dollar that is invested in this program.

Today, newer engines produce 90 percent less toxic emissions than the older diesel engines. However, only 30 percent of trucks and heavy-duty vehicles transition to these cleaner technologies. We need to follow the science and accelerate the replacement of old engines with newer, cleaner engines.

From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013, DERA grant funding has replaced or retooled almost 59,000 engines in vehicles, trucks, trains, and other equipment. Again, DERA is an effective, proven program that is delivering results.

I strongly urge Members to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns.

Over the last 30 years or so, the air quality in the United States has improved dramatically, despite the fact that we have seen huge increases in vehicle miles traveled, a 30-something percent increase in our GDP, and a 30-something percent increase in population. Yet, we have seen dramatic improvement in air quality, and I appreciate the fact that government programs have had a part to play in that.

In regard to the savings, the EPA has said that for every dollar we spend, we will get \$14 in benefits. I would also like to point out that they also say that the Clean Power Plan will help the economy and that EPA regulations haven't lost jobs. I think the EPA estimates on savings are a little suspect.

The program was funded at \$30 million in FY 2015 and \$50 million in 2016. Now we are considering a bill to increase it to \$100 million in 2017. We cannot afford to continue spending without limits and pretend as if there are no consequences. Keep in mind that there are 14 programs. Surely, we can consolidate these into one effective program.

I also think it is important to note that this was supposed to expire after the first authorization. It was reauthorized for 4 more years. And that expires this year, making any appropriation for FY 2017 another wasteful, unauthorized program.

The Republican Study Committee budget recommended elimination and noted that the grants have gone to a number of wasteful programs.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I want to point out that DERA is not a regulatory program. The power plant rule that was mentioned earlier is a regulatory program.

What DERA does is replace old technology with the new technology that is up to 90 percent cleaner than the old trucks, old diesel engines that we are presently using. This is working.

I am not in favor of programs and continuous studies and other oppressive methods by EPA that don't produce clean air. This does. It was mentioned that our air is getting cleaner. It is getting cleaner because of programs like DERA that actually work. It is measurable in the South Coast Air Quality Management District and other areas throughout the United States.

They have been able to take these dirty, old trucks off the road. You have all seen them. You have been on the freeway and you see an old diesel truck that is putting out more emissions than virtually everything else around them. You take that truck off the road and it has immediate results.

So let's not get rid of something that works. Let's work against these regulatory programs that oppress the economy and don't have any results.

I might point out, too, the administration has been opposed to DERA. Most of the environmental folks have

been opposed because they don't want any carbon in the economy. So they don't want us to clean up diesel because they want to have electric vehicles or zero emission vehicles, which do not have the horsepower or the ability to deliver the goods that we need to have in this Nation.

So, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PALMER. In regard to the EPA, the gentleman from California cited an EPA finding on the benefits and my response to that—that it is not a regulatory program—but that is beside the fact. What it is, is a duplication of other programs. It is unauthorized and it is wasteful.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I might point out that the FBI is not authorized at the present time. We continue to fund it.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1930

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, last August, the Environmental Protection Agency was responsible for the blowout at the Gold King Mine in Colorado that spilled 3 million gallons of wastewater, impacting New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and the Navajo Nation.

I was in Farmington, New Mexico, when the toxic plume turned the Animas River yellow. I met with the community and heard their concerns about the toll that the spill was taking on businesses, farmers, families, and individuals.

Madam Chair, we are almost 1 year removed from the spill, and in communities that have been impacted, there remains serious concerns about the long-term effects that the spill will have on the river and all that its water sustains, from drinking water to farming and livestock.

Long-term water quality monitoring is essential to ensure that communities along the Animas River have the data they need to protect the health of all those who rely on this water.

Unfortunately, the State of New Mexico and the EPA have been unable to agree on what the long-term monitoring should look like. As a result, the State has moved ahead with a lawsuit against the EPA.

Madam Chair, it is disappointing that it has come to this point of legal action. My amendment today seeks to address this issue by providing \$6 million to direct the EPA to work with affected States and Indian Tribes to implement long-term monitoring programs for water quality on the Animas and San Juan Rivers in response to the Gold King Mine spill.

The State of New Mexico has worked with stakeholders to develop a robust monitoring plan that I believe can serve as a basis for a truly comprehensive effort. Monitoring now and well into the future is necessary to protect the health of all those who rely on this water, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It is important that EPA right the wrong that caused the Gold King Mine spill, and ensure that the affected States and Tribes have the resources they need following the spill.

The FY17 bill includes language instructing the EPA to continue to operate a temporary water treatment plant to treat contaminated flows in the area until a more permanent water treatment solution is developed. And the FY16 omnibus instructed EPA to work with the States and tribes on an independent water monitoring plan.

At this time I must respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I would also ask the gentleman to work with me as the committee continues to monitor the implementation and what the EPA is continuing to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I appreciate the leadership of the chairman. He has been very

gracious, he and his staff, with several amendments that are important to New Mexico during this debate as well.

What has happened now is the temporary facility has been located in the State of Colorado as well, where this has taken place, where this blowout took place; but we are still seeing remnants of heavy metals all the way down to that contamination plume, and it just hasn't been enough.

I will read something that our Attorney General from the State of New Mexico recently said.

"The release of hazardous substances into waters that are the lifeblood of our economy and culture in New Mexico has had a devastating impact on our historical rural, agricultural and tribal communities . . . It is inappropriate for the EPA to impose weak testing standards in New Mexico and I am demanding the highest testing standards that the EPA would impose in any other state in the nation to protect the health and well-being of our citizens. Additionally, remediation and compensation dollars have been far too minimal for these very special agricultural and cultural communities who depend on this precious water source for irrigation and drinking water. They must be properly compensated and there must be appropriate independent monitoring to prevent future dangers to public health and the economy."

Attorney General Hector Balderas.

Mr. CALVERT, I really want to be able to get a vote on this one. I understand the opposition here, but I really want to force this point home to the EPA and the administration, that what has been put on the table, which is \$2 million, is simply not enough to help us in New Mexico.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Again, I appreciate what the gentleman is up to. I wouldn't expect you not to have a vote if you choose to have a vote. Just know that we are working on this, and we will continue to work on this. We will continue to work with your office, but at this point I have to reluctantly oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 106, strike lines 8 through 22.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment strikes language in the bill that would exempt a number of potentially damaging activities in our national forests from full consideration under the National Environmental Policy Act. Simply put, this sort of language has no place in an appropriations bill.

Our national forests are a true public legacy that sustains both our environment and our economy. They provide clean air, clean water, precious wildlife habitat, and they support approximately 450,000 jobs throughout the country. We should all be coming together to ensure that our forests are healthy and that future generations will be able to enjoy them.

Yet, the language that my amendment proposes to strike could allow many types of damaging activities to occur in our national forests without a full review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, as we call it.

NEPA has a simple premise; you look before you leap. This landmark law gives the public an opportunity to review and comment on actions proposed by the government, adding unique perspectives to the evaluation process that highly specialized, mission-driven agencies might otherwise ignore.

The underlying legislation proposes to make six different activities in our national forests eligible for a categorical exclusion under NEPA, which means a full review would not be conducted and the public would not have the right to be heard.

While some of these activities may be appropriate to consider for a categorical exclusion, they should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and should not automatically be eligible for categorical exclusion, as this legislation proposes.

As the Council on Environmental Quality has stated: "Categorical exclusions are appropriate in many circumstances but should not be relied on if they thwart the purposes of NEPA, compromising the quality and transparency of agency decisionmaking or the opportunity for meaningful public participation."

I couldn't agree with them more. CEQ was right, and that is exactly what this bill proposes to do.

As an example, the underlying bill proposes to exclude all activities related to reducing hazardous fuel loads from a full NEPA review. This makes

little sense. If a hazardous fuel load reduction is not done properly, it could destroy an entire forest. This is exactly the sort of activity that should have a thorough and comprehensive NEPA review.

I hope my colleagues will join me in standing up for public participation in government decisionmaking by supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I must say, as I rise in opposition to this amendment, that I serve on the Natural Resources Committee with the gentlewoman from Michigan, and I know that we hold a common idea to be good stewards of our resources. We just happen to have a difference of opinion on the best way to do that on this issue, so I must rise in opposition to her amendment.

Our Nation's forests are in dire health, and Congress must provide the Forest Service additional tools to allow more management of our national forest system.

This amendment would needlessly deny the Forest Service an opportunity to more quickly address a forest system that is overgrown and prone to wildfire, disease, and insect infestation.

Last summer I was proud to sponsor H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forest Act, which passed the House with a strong bipartisan majority. This bill included several provisions to allow the Forest Service to engage in urgently needed restoration in a more timely fashion.

These are forest stands that are already being destroyed by natural occurrences; and in order to restore those forest habitats, we have to act in an urgent and a timely manner.

One specific provision would allow the Forest Service to treat up to 3,000 acres of land at a time under a categorical exclusion from NEPA within limited circumstances. Some of these circumstances include treating a forest infected by invasive species, if a forest has been affected by a natural disaster such as a hurricane or tornado, or if work is needed to protect a municipal water source.

This provision was based on a carefully crafted provision in the 2014 farm bill that the Forest Service has used successfully to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire in our rural communities. I am pleased that Chairman CALVERT chose to include this provision in the fiscal year 2017 Interior Appropriations bill.

The Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony from stakeholders

across the country about the dire need to better manage our forests. We have heard from the Forest Service that nearly 60 million acres of land are in need of some form of treatment. While we wait for the Senate to act on wildfire legislation, we must continue to seek opportunities to help reduce the threat of wildfire to communities across the country.

This amendment would strip this important provision from the appropriations bill. We should be doing more to shorten the timeframe for the Forest Service to engage in restoration work. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I want to quickly respond to the comments made by my dear friend. We are good friends, and we all do need to work together to protect our great lands in this country, but I would respectfully disagree. I have nothing but the utmost respect for both of my Republican colleagues that I hate disagreeing with, and we agree on the same goal, but I respectfully disagree on your disagreeing on my amendment.

Some of these activities may be appropriate for a categorical exclusion, but that should be decided by the agency on a case-by-case basis, not be dictated by Congress, which you tell us many times, in an appropriations bill.

Make no mistake, mandating the use of categorical exclusions, like this bill proposes, is simply a ruse to make an end run around NEPA and the public process that is so important to it.

We often hear that NEPA is a scapegoat for projects being delayed, and I would not want that to be the case; but GAO and others have found that outside issues, including the complexity of the project, local opposition and, most importantly, funding issues, are almost always the cause of the delays.

We shouldn't be limiting public comments and involvement in government decisions, but, instead, should be enhancing them. This bill does the opposite, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I just want to make a point. At this time there are about 66 million dead and dying trees in my State. It is estimated that over the next few years, we could lose up to 120 million trees. That is 20 percent of the entire State of California's total. The trees are dying from drought, severe insect and disease infestation, which only intensifies the potential for disastrous and potentially catastrophic fires.

Unfortunately, we have already seen the loss of life and property from the fast-moving wildfires this year, just most recently, right in the Majority Leader's Congressional District, where people, unfortunately, lost their lives.

I have worked with the senior Senator from California on this. We have used this to the benefit of our State, and other States have used it to the benefit of theirs. This provision is truly limited in nature.

□ 1945

It can only be used on small acreages about 3,000 acres or less.

Madam Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, Federal land management agencies are biting off more than they can chew. Not only are these agencies tasked with managing one-third of the entire landmass in the United States of America, but they are also asked to provide law enforcement and police support to some 660 million acres on the Federal estate.

Land management agencies should not be in the business of policing. Currently, the Nation's largest land management agency, the Bureau of Land Management, has just one office—one person—per 1 million acres of Federal land. This is an inadequate system that does not serve the public, Federal lands, or local communities very well.

Local county sheriffs, on the other hand, and local law enforcement deputies are in a better position to police lands within their county. These individuals are known by members of their community. They are trusted, they are better equipped, and there are more of them. Already local law enforcement agencies contract with the Federal Government to carry out the very same law enforcement functions that Federal agencies require. We need to expand this concept and take actions to limit the role of land management agency law enforcement officials.

Madam Chair, I believe we must work to transfer authorities and, ultimately, funding to those local jurisdictions and sheriffs. There will come a time when the Appropriations Committee will play a key role in executing this strategy. I request that the chairman work with Chairman ROB BISHOP of the Committee on Natural Resources, me, and other Members to accomplish this important policy change.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, I am pleased the gentleman has raised this issue. It is important to work together to ensure law enforcement arrangements are best suited to the pop-

ulations they serve. I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to this issue, and I look forward to working together to assess the role of law enforcement.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 23 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 114-683.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask that it be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 425.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It strikes section 425 of H.R. 5538. Section 425 would prohibit the EPA from updating the definition of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" under the Clean Water Act.

These definitions underlie section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which governs dredge and fill permitting, one of the act's most important components. Put more simply, section 425 would continue giving real legal cover to mountaintop mining companies to dump mining waste into valley streams. As such, section 425 is an attack on the Clean Water Act.

Now, mountaintop mining for coal produces a lot of unusable excess material, known as overburden. The cheapest and easiest way for industry to dispose of overburden is to bulldoze it into valleys and waterways surrounding these decapitated mountains. This had been illegal because the Clean Water Act categorized overburden as waste, which cannot be disposed of in that manner. However, in a 2002 giveaway to the mountaintop mining industry, the George W. Bush administration reclassified overburden as fill. This cleared the path for it to be dumped in mountain valleys once teeming with life.

As if mining overburden were not enough, the definition of fill was expanded to also include material such as wood chips, construction debris, and plastic. As a result, every year, 120 miles of headwater streams are buried in mining debris. These so-called valley fills can be more than 1 mile long, each, and hundreds of feet deep.

This overburden doesn't just take up space; it is also an environmental hazard. Mining debris can contain chemicals and toxins that pose health risks to humans and ecosystems alike. For example, studies have found substantially higher levels of selenium, a mineral that is toxic to fish in high doses, in rivers near mountaintop mine sites. These hazardous substances also pose real dangers to the downstream users of the water.

Overburden dumping and the mining that causes it produce soil erosion and waterway siltation. A 2008 EPA study found that 90 percent of the streams downstream of surface mining had impaired aquatic life. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the loss of forest and aquatic habitat to mountaintop mining affects almost 250 species, including several listed species.

This practice also destroys an archetypal American landscape, one which gave rise to a unique culture which has shaped generations of Appalachian residents and which has left its imprint on the broader American culture.

Allowing mountaintop mining operations to continue dumping their waste into our Nation's streams and rivers is both dangerous and irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to join me in putting an end to it. Allow EPA to do their work and protect the environment and the public's health. Support my amendment striking section 425.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, the language in section 425 simply maintains the status quo regarding the definition of fill material for purposes of the Clean Water Act. The existing definition was put in place through a rulemaking initiated by the Clinton administration and finalized by the Bush administration. That rule harmonized the definition on the books of the Corps and EPA so both agencies were working within the same definition.

Any attempts to redefine this important definition could significantly negatively impact the ability of all earthmoving industries—road and highway construction and private and commercial enterprise—to obtain vital CWA section 404 permits.

Changing the definition of fill material could result in the loss of up to 375,000 high-paying mining jobs and jeopardize over 1 million jobs that are dependent upon the economic output generated by these operations.

For these reasons, I support the underlying language and oppose the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chairwoman, the gentleman's points are well taken that the status quo is pre-

served, and that is the problem. Section 425 would prohibit any change in the status quo and would prohibit the EPA from updating the definitions of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" under the Clean Water Act, thereby hamstringing the EPA from making any kind of sensible updating of those terms. Any attempt at this point to enumerate the number of jobs that could be lost in some as yet undefined change of those terms simply lacks credibility at this point.

There is no point in hamstringing the EPA in this fashion by refusing to allow any further clarification of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material."

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Madam Chairman, I do also rise in opposition to this amendment. As a Member representing southern West Virginia, I know firsthand the effect a rewrite of the fill material regulations would have on coal mining operations. What this amendment would do would freeze operations and lead to even further layoffs on top of the more than 10,000 jobs we have lost in just the last 5 years.

As the chairman referenced, in last year's omnibus, Congress included—Congress included—similar legislation preventing the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from changing the definition of fill material. Unfortunately, redefining fill material would harm both existing and future operations in the coal mining business, resulting in the loss of thousands of good jobs.

Congress should include this provision to prohibit the EPA from changing the definition of fill material, and I urge opposition.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 147, strike lines 10 through 21.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that

would strike section 427 from the underlying bill.

My amendment would preserve the Army Corps of Engineers' and the Environmental Protection Agency's final rule that revises regulations and defines the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act. More than 1 million public comments were submitted during this process, a majority of which support the waters of the United States rule. In issuing the final rule, the agencies' intention was to clarify questions of the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction, consistent with the agencies' scientific and technical expertise.

One in three Americans rely on public drinking water systems not previously protected by the Clean Water Act. This rule changes that.

The water crisis in Flint, Michigan, and the crumbling drinking water infrastructure in neighborhoods and communities around the country reinforces the need to protect our streams, ponds, and wetlands. These challenges impact millions of lives and disproportionately affect poor and minority communities.

Our country faces a very difficult choice. We can either overlook the challenges facing our existing water infrastructure and the millions of lives it affects and the billions of dollars that it costs us, or we can all work together to find solutions that ensure that all Americans have access to safe, clean, and affordable drinking water.

The waters of the United States rule is a commonsense reform designed to secure our water sources, while guaranteeing protections to millions of Americans.

□ 2000

This rule represents a commitment to protecting and restoring the national water resources that are vital for our health, environment, and economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR.

CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendment No. 27.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 149, strike lines 3 through 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

My amendment would strike section 429, which delays implementation of the EPA's lead renovation, repair, and painting rule.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, at least 4 million households have children who are exposed to high levels of lead. This includes 535,000 children younger than the age of 5. The problem is particularly prevalent in low-income communities.

Yet, even as lead poisoning is a front page news story, the majority ignores another threat from lead and paint. There is no safe blood level of lead for children. That is why it is so imperative that we do everything we can to help families avoid lead poisoning.

The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed reasonable requirements for workers to train and follow lead-safe work practices. It is important to mention that the rule does not apply to do-it-yourselfers or those making improvements to newer homes.

Opponents argue that when EPA first proposed the rule back in 2008, the rule offered a training exemption for those contractors who used an EPA-approved test kit that meets specific criteria. There are now three EPA recognized test kits available on the market.

In light of the tragedy in Flint, Michigan, it is unfathomable that this bill would actively strip one of EPA's tools for addressing lead paint in homes. If we do not remove this harmful rider, we are choosing to endanger the health of our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, the Lowey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear, the language in the bill does not block EPA's implementation of the rule.

To date, EPA has not yet approved a test kit that meets the false positive and false negative standards. It is yet another example of EPA finalizing a rule with unattainable standards.

Therefore, the FY17 bill prompts the EPA to finish what it intended to do 7 years ago—approve a lead test kit as an alternative to costly third-party lab testing so as to prevent delays and reduce the cost of in-home renovations. Otherwise, EPA should solicit formal public comment on alternatives. The language in the bill prevents EPA from collecting fines for paperwork and recordkeeping violations until EPA solicits public comments on alternatives.

It is straightforward, commonsense language. As such, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Lowey amendment.

This amendment would strike a provision of the bill that waives part of the EPA's lead renovation, repair, and painting rule.

Mr. Chairman, after Flint, we have become more aware of the growing need to protect our communities from the devastating impacts of lead exposure. According to the CDC, at least 4 million households have children who are exposed to high levels of lead, especially in low-income communities.

EPA's rule has been in effect since 2008, so why now, 8 years later, is the majority trying to undermine these protections? Why now? Why after Flint?

Mr. Chairman, lead paint is still present in millions of homes. Now is not the time, it is absolutely the wrong time, to give industry a pass at the expense of America's children.

I urge adoption of the amendment to protect the health and well-being of the American people.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for those important words.

Either we protect our children from lead paint or we don't.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody here would want to live in a home or send their children to a school that was renovated by a company that recklessly did not have lead-safe training. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to take every step possible to prevent harmful lead exposure.

Vote for my amendment, vote for the Lowey amendment, to improve this bill and help ensure that fewer children will suffer lead poisoning.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, we are talking about an agency that can't even get a test right after 7 years. Until they do that, it is yet another example of EPA finalizing a rule with unattainable standards.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 149, strikes lines 18 through 25.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 430 from the underlying bill. Section 430 blocks efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that industries which handle hazardous substances set aside sufficient funds, in the form of bonds or insurance, to clean up toxic spills or releases that are attributable to their hazardous activities.

Under current law, the EPA is required to set financial responsibility requirements for industries at high risk of polluting the environment to the point of creating these toxic Superfund sites. Congress required the EPA to establish financial responsibility requirements to ensure that taxpayers do not have to pay for the cost of cleaning up contaminated sites.

Communities across America experience firsthand what it is like to live and breathe through the contamination of a serial polluter. Right now, thousands of people in my hometown of Los Angeles are living through this very nightmare. After nearly 30 years of operating a lead recycling battery plant, Exide Technologies in the Los Angeles area shut its operations down after contaminating some 10,000 thousand homes with lead—let me repeat that—10,000 homes with lead in the Los Angeles area.

It has been more than a year since Exide shut down this plant and we still don't know who will foot the bill for cleaning those nearly 10,000 homes with each home carrying up to a \$40,000 price tag to get cleaned up. A \$40,000 price tag, 10,000 homes—do the math—\$400 million. And that \$400 million only deals with the cleanup, it doesn't deal with the health effects that those 10,000-plus people will have to deal with for their children and for themselves having suffered from the contamination of lead in and around their property.

Mr. Chairman, section 430 lets polluters off the hook and leaves the American taxpayer on the hook for cleaning up their messes. I don't believe the American people intend for American taxpayers to have to take on the cost of cleaning up someone else's pollution.

That is why I have introduced this amendment to strike section 430 from

the bill, so that polluters, not American taxpayers, take the responsibility for cleaning up their mess.

I urge passage of my amendment to ensure that polluters, not taxpayers, clean up their pollution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, EPA is under a court order to propose a rule by December 2016, according to a suit brought by the environmentalists, to compel EPA to move forward with more regulation on a schedule they dictate.

BLM, the Forest Service, and the States already impose financial assurance regulations. Therefore, any EPA regulations proposed would be duplicative.

The Western Governors' Association, along with others, have indicated a willingness to work together to ensure that there aren't gaps in the existing regulatory framework so such requirements remain protective. Therefore, there already is a process in place, and language that has been included in the bill, to alleviate the need for EPA to expend taxpayer resources to develop yet another set of duplicative rules.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 430 in this bill provides a blanket prohibition of the EPA having the opportunity to make sure that financial responsibility requirements are imposed on polluters. There may be some provisions in this bill to try to deal with some of these aspects of pollution, but there is nothing that would require the polluter to show financial responsibility if we don't get rid of section 430.

Therefore, in this bill, we would essentially be making lawful polluters polluting communities and not having to take responsibility for cleaning them up. I don't believe the American people, and certainly not American taxpayers, are expecting Congress to be passing bills that put the burden on taxpayers to clean up someone else's pollution.

Beyond the cost of the pollution is the cost to our families. Children who are infected by lead contamination could suffer a permanent effect. I think that we want to make sure we are providing our children and our families with every bit of safety they expect, especially when they had no responsibility for the contamination of the pollution that exists in their neighborhoods.

I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment which simply would strike

this provision so that EPA can do the work that we expect it to do, and that is to preserve the safety and health of our communities by making sure if you are going to have a business that pollutes, that you be responsible for cleaning it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I encourage opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, if a business pollutes, then it is the responsibility of that business, not the taxpayer, to pay for the cleanup. It is that simple and it is morally right and fair.

I represent Vernon, California, where a lead-acid battery recycling plant, for years, blanketed families in and around Vernon with lead, arsenic, and other toxins.

The plant eventually closed but tragically, its environmental damage remains, leaving an estimated 10,000 contaminated homes.

Because there are no clear requirements for financial responsibility, the response to the lead contamination in my district was delayed, and after more than a year, it still has not been resolved. Families living in these areas continue to live in fear for their children while others struggle to care for children who, as a result of this contamination, are suffering from learning disabilities, cancer and other health related issues.

To allow section 430 to prohibit the EPA from issuing financial responsibility requirements for businesses that handle hazardous substances which can pollute our communities across the country is madness, Mr. Speaker.

We must pass this amendment to ensure that polluters who cheat the system pay the bill, not the American taxpayer.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No 29 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), I offer amendment No. 29.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 150, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 151, line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, everyone who doesn't deny the science understands that climate change is real

and dangerous. Uncontrolled carbon pollution is going into the atmosphere, trapping more heat, and warming the planet.

Americans are experiencing the results in every part of this country. From more devastating fires in the West, including San Diego, to flooding in West Virginia, to coastal erosion in superstorms along the east coast, we are experiencing climate change today and it is getting worse.

□ 2015

We have a choice—pretend it is not happening and abandon future generations, or start to clean up the carbon pollution that is driving climate change.

As President Obama recently said: "Climate change is no longer some far-off problem. It is happening here. It is happening now."

We can't wait for some future generation to take action. To that end, the EPA finalized a workable plan to reduce carbon emissions from power plants, which are the largest uncontrolled source of man-made greenhouse gases in the United States.

The Clean Power Plan gives the States tremendous flexibility to choose how to achieve those reductions. The goals are State-specific and cost-effective. This is a moderate and reasonable approach that ensures flexibility, affordability, reliability, and investment in clean energy technologies; and polls show that the public supports the Clean Power Plan by large majorities. It outlines a path to cleaner air, better health, a safer climate, and a stronger economy. If we make these investments in cleaner energy, the United States can be the world leader in industries of the future.

The majority wants to stop this. They want to deny the science, pretend climate change isn't happening, and let power plants keep spewing carbon pollution without control. They refuse to act to limit carbon pollution, and now they are outraged that President Obama is keeping his word and using his authority under the Clean Air Act to act because we in Congress won't. So they included language in the underlying bill that aims to block the implementation of the Clean Power Plan and the EPA's carbon pollution standards for new and modified power plants. This is a "just say 'no'" agenda. My amendment strikes the harmful rider from the bill.

Let's not heed the arguments on behalf of companies that profit from the status quo. These are defeatist arguments. They aren't interested in developing a plan to help us reduce emissions while maintaining a reasonably and reliably priced electricity system. We have already wasted enough time on legislation to "just say 'no'" to climate action. Now Congress must move on. What we cannot do, as President Obama said, is "condemn our children to a planet beyond their capacity to repair it."

I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment. The Clean Power Plan is an important, long overdue, and critical tool in our fight against global climate change.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the Supreme Court has ruled on a number of occasions that the EPA does not have the authority to rewrite the Clean Air Act, as it has been attempting to do. In February, the Supreme Court issued a stay on the EPA's greenhouse gas rule. It is no surprise that the EPA finds itself on shaky legal ground as it attempts to rely on limited authorities to write a rule that would vastly expand its reach.

This administration's policies, regulations, and rhetoric are all aimed at making energy more expensive in America. The administration cannot be allowed to change the laws of the land administratively, which is why the language in this bill should remain in this bill.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment to strike.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The effects of climate change are real, and they are being felt by Americans every day. NASA says that climate change is causing drought and increased forest fire frequency in the West, flooding in the Midwest, declining water supplies in the Southeast. Ninety-seven percent of all climate experts agree that human activity, specifically the combustion of fossil fuels and the release of carbon into the atmosphere, is changing our climate; yet this Congress continues to deny that there is a crisis, and it refuses to take the action that is necessary to protect the safety, the health, and the well-being of our constituents.

Mr. Chair, the standards that the administration has proposed are just about protecting the health of our children and putting this Nation on a path to a 30 percent reduction in carbon pollution from the power sector by 2030.

We cannot continue to deny that there is something happening with our weather. We cannot continue to deny that there is something happening with our climate nor can we continue to deny that, if we do this right, we will create a new generation of jobs and careers in new technologies. For those

reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, we, as a country, should be pursuing a true all-of-the-above approach to energy-electricity generation. Unfortunately, this administration's power plant rules would pick winners and losers. It would determine the market for coal, cost miners their jobs, and raise energy prices for all Americans.

The EPA has exceeded its legal authority by double regulating coal-fired power plants and by forcing States to fundamentally shift their energy portfolios away from coal. It sets standards for new coal-fired power plants that are based on technologies which have not even been proven to be commercially available.

While this administration is using every regulatory effort that is possible to put our hardworking coal miners in the unemployment line, we are pushing back here on the Appropriations Committee. We included this important provision in this bill to protect miners, to protect families, and to protect businesses and our economy.

The chairman is exactly right when he references the United States Supreme Court. The other side would simply take casually the fact that there is no legal authority for the administration to pursue the rules and regulations like in this particular case. It is critically important that we oppose this amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I understand the gentleman's concern about coal. Without the implementation of the Clean Power Plan, coal has been affected by the market, not by the EPA, and the availability of natural gas has certainly, I think, hurt the coal industry. I understand that, but this is a sensible approach to dealing with air quality and climate change; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 152, strike lines 14 through 24.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, my amendment would strike section 434, a harmful policy rider that limits the ability of our environmental agencies to take action to improve public health and to fight the root causes of climate change.

If we are to lower the impact of greenhouse gas emissions, we need Federal action. The largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States is from burning fossil fuels, which raises atmospheric levels of CO₂. Greenhouse gas emissions can affect coastal regions, energy, defense, food supplies, wildfire preparedness, and our quality of life.

This rider blocks the Environmental Protection Agency's ongoing efforts to reduce the damage that hydrofluorocarbons do to our climate. Hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, are factory-made gasses that are used in air-conditioning and refrigeration and are up to 10,000 times more potent pound for pound than carbon dioxide.

While not as abundant as carbon dioxide, super pollutants, like HFCs and methane, have contributed up to 40 percent of observed global warming. Unless we act now, the United States' HFC emissions are expected to double by 2020 and to triple by 2030.

By limiting the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to propose, finalize, or enforce any regulation or guidance regarding HFCs, this rider would undercut its ability to protect public health and to demonstrate American leadership in emissions reductions.

The EPA's Significant New Alternatives Policy Program, or SNAP, requires us to evaluate substitutes that are already being developed by industry for super pollutants like HFCs. Through SNAP, we can ensure a more smooth transition to safer alternatives for our country's industrial sector. Last year, the SNAP finalized a new rule on HFCs that the Environmental Investigation Agency estimates will reduce emissions by 2030 by the equivalent of taking 21 million cars off the road.

The standards set by the EPA will drive U.S. and international innovation and the market development of low-emission and energy-efficient refrigeration, air-conditioning, foam blowing agents, and aerosol technologies. These innovations will actually get at one of the root causes of climate change before we are forced to react to increasingly extreme weather and sea level rise.

By embracing these forward-thinking proposals, we can tackle the low-hanging fruit while adopting alternatives that are actually much more energy efficient than current HFCs. This is one

example of how embracing the clean energy revolution doesn't just limit damage to our climate but also increases America's competitiveness and creates economic opportunity. Last year, we saw major companies, including Coca-Cola, Carrier, DuPont, Honeywell, PepsiCo, and other industry leaders commit to voluntarily reducing harmful HFC emissions.

I appreciate the concerns of some in the industry about the pace at which they are required to transition to lower emission materials, but the answer to that is not to halt this process entirely. Preventing the SNAP program from functioning when less harmful materials are being developed is not the right approach. My amendment strikes this shortsighted rider so that America can continue to be a leader in advancing innovative solutions to reducing our emissions. We should not be handcuffing the important work being done at the EPA to reduce super pollutants. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, last year, the EPA issued a final rule to disqualify many refrigerants and other chemicals. The rule contained aggressive deadlines for the phase-out of many chemicals. Some of those deadlines applied within 6 months. Historical experience with the Montreal Protocol indicated that manufacturers needed 6-plus years to successfully transition between new materials.

It is nice if the Fortune 100 companies, as the gentleman mentioned, are able to quickly transfer their technologies, but a lot of Main Street people can't. They just simply go broke. Clearly, the EPA chose winners and losers, and for the losers, the timelines are absolutely unworkable. Manufacturers need time to implement engineering and technology changes and to address new risk and safety challenges.

No sooner did the EPA finalize its regulation last year to disqualify certain products than the EPA initiated version 2.0—that the rulemaking is now in the works. This is truly an out-of-control process that is driven by the White House's agenda.

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

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I take the gentleman's point. I would just say again that, if there are concerns about the timeline, I would be more than willing to work—and I am sure my colleagues would—on a better timeline, but stopping all activity is not the answer. That is why I think this is the appropriate response; so I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 154, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 155, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, the social—or real—cost of carbon is the monetary estimate of the damages caused by carbon dioxide emissions to the environment, health, and economic growth.

Today's bill contains an unnecessary and harmful policy rider that would delay, indefinitely, incorporating that cost in rulemaking or guidance documents. My amendment would strike that bad rider and would, instead, put us on a path of responsible policymaking that reflects the realities of changing climates and increasingly extreme weather events.

□ 2030

Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg's bipartisan Risky Business report notes that accounting for the real cost of carbon emissions and preparing for climate change is a smart business practice.

If we continue on our current path, by 2050, between \$66 billion and \$106 billion worth of existing coastal property will likely be below sea level nationwide. Eighty percent of California's GDP is derived from our coastal counties.

Greenhouse gas-driven changes in temperature by burning fossil fuels will necessitate construction of new power generation that Mayor Bloomberg's report estimates will cost residential and commercial ratepayers as much as \$12 billion per year. That is \$12 billion that could be spent by families to put their kids through school or to buy a home. It could be spent by businesses to hire more employees or give annual bonuses.

Accounting for the social cost of carbon now provides greater certainty and greater freedom in the future.

I anticipate my colleagues in opposition to this amendment will suggest that the harmful rider merely delays using the social cost of carbon until a new working group can update the data we use to guide rulemaking. In practice, this would send this rule back to

the drawing board when the data we have now about how carbon emissions damage our economy and our health is perfectly adequate and backed by peer-reviewed science.

By adding more layers of bureaucracy, this rider rejects a forward-thinking approach already used by the private sector and backed by science in favor of the status quo, in favor of doing nothing.

There is a real cost to our environment and our prosperity associated with delaying this rule. For too long we have heard that we have had to choose between supporting prosperity and a clean environment. The implication is we can't have both, but that is a false choice we can't afford to make. We have to provide both economic opportunity and clean water and air for future generations.

I want to take a cue from the private sector, from businesses that already account for the cost of carbon, and let's be sensible and support this amendment.

I want to thank my friends—Congressman POLIS, Congressman LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman ESTY, Congressman BEYER, and Congressman WELCH—for backing this effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have long been concerned with how the EPA conducts its cost-benefit analysis to justify its rulemaking. This is something that the committee has discussed with the EPA on a number of occasions. The Supreme Court recently ruled that EPA's approach to examining costs in their regulations was, at the least, flawed.

The administration's revised estimates for the social cost of carbon help justify, on paper, larger benefits from reducing carbon emissions in any proposed rule. If the administration can inflate the price tag so that the benefits always exceed the costs, then the administration can gold plate required regulations from any department or any agency.

Section 436 says that the administration should reconvene a working group to revise the estimates in a more transparent manner and to make that information available to the public.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the majority has repeatedly brought bills to this same House floor that add

requirements for Federal agencies to use more cost-benefit analyses; but now, when we are dealing with climate change, we are told that we should remove requirements to honestly consider the cost of climate change.

Which way do you want it? Is cost-benefit analysis only a good thing when it suits the majority's purpose to slow regulation and a bad thing when it may shed some light on the true cost of our carbon-based actions?

Ignoring the facts because we don't like them won't make the problem go away. Greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are causing climate change with profound monetary costs for our health, infrastructure, food security, and national security.

Let's bring more information and transparency into the Federal rule-making process by using the social cost of carbon to quantify those costs. That way we can understand the risks and make sound investments in our Nation's future.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this is ironic because we hear from Republicans all the time about the importance of cost-benefit analyses before this regulation, before that regulation. Well, of course, we acknowledge and I acknowledge that there are costs to regulation with regard to emissions, there is no doubt. There are also benefits.

I have a tourism-dependent district. We have great ski areas like Vail, Breckenridge. Well, guess what. That is climate dependent. We have agriculture in my district—climate dependent.

You know what? I would also acknowledge, of course, all the costs, all the benefits, those are estimates.

You know, what? No model is perfect, but I guarantee you that the model is far superior to just throwing it out altogether and having no model. There are real costs to carbon emissions, and it is completely appropriate to use the best science-driven data to estimate those in any type of regulation.

It is important to look at costs as benefits, and I feel we are making the argument our Republican friends usually make. But here, in this case, they don't happen to like these particular costs. Maybe they don't think they are real. Maybe they don't believe in them. But we let science guide us.

The fact that I have a weather-dependent district and we have a climate-dependent economy across our country is powerful testimony towards including the social cost of carbon.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, folks, here is what is going on: the EPA and other Federal agencies are increasingly using this thing called

social cost of carbon in their environmental rulemaking.

So what is social cost of carbon? It is an ambiguous and confusing matrix that has been used simply to justify the validity of many of the administration's clean air environmental regulations that target the direct and indirect carbon dioxide emissions from various sources.

Since its very first use, the administration has recalculated the models multiple times in order to inflate the supposed cost of small increases in CO₂ in the atmosphere and, thus, supposed benefits.

What is most outrageous is that the administration, which the minority here says is just simply trying to put in the economic factors, is actually ignoring the Office of Management and Budget's circular A-4, which explicitly states that "a real discount rate of 7 percent should be used as a base-case for regulatory analysis."

Guess what. They ran the numbers. Seven percent doesn't get them what they need from the social costs, so what they do is ignore OMB and come up with their own factors. That is the deceptive nature of their supposed cost factor. Change the underlying assumptions, change the factors, get the results you want that justify your findings.

Folks, that is not how we should be doing it. I strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, again, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point that 7 percent is a pretty aggressive discount rate and maybe we should talk about the methodology. But what we should not do is prevent the discussion in its entirety, which is what that language does.

So I hope that my colleagues will support our amendment and that we will be able to get it right. We can agree on a methodology that fairly represents this issue, and I would be happy to work with my colleague. I hope they will support my amendment so we can, at least, have this discussion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this is voodoo environmentalism, so I would absolutely have opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 155, strike lines 9 through 15.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise to speak on behalf of the amendment that I have offered to protect farmworkers throughout this Nation.

Every day, farmworkers work long hours under the scorching sun in one of the most dangerous industries in this country, and they suffer the highest rates of chemical injuries and skin disorders due to pesticide exposure. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that up to 3,000 farmworkers suffer acute pesticide poisoning every year through their work-related exposure.

Every year, an estimated 1.1 billion pounds of pesticides are applied to agricultural crops in the United States. According to the EPA, 10,000 to 20,000 farmworkers suffer pesticide poisoning annually. Exposure to pesticides increases the risk of chronic health problems amongst adult and child farmworkers, such as cancer, infertility, neurological disorders, and respiratory conditions.

There are approximately half a million child farmworkers in the U.S., and farmworker children face increased risks of cancer and birth defects. It should be noted that this workplace, in the farms and working crops, is the only area in this country where child labor laws do not apply. Should we then increase the children's risk and exposure because they are not covered by a law that covers the rest of the children in this country?

Research also shows that both farmworkers and their children may suffer decreased intellectual functioning from even low levels of exposure to insecticides, which are widely used in agriculture.

After more than 20 years, the Environmental Protection Agency finally made the long overdue updates to the worker protection standards for farmworkers. The standards provide basic workplace protections to farmworkers to reduce harmful exposures and result in fewer pesticide-related injuries, illnesses, birth defects, and deaths among farmworkers and their family members.

Farmworkers play a critical role in our economy, ensuring that our constituents have nutritious, quality food

on their tables. The 2017 Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act contains a harmful provision, section 437, that will remove farmworkers' rights to a designated representative.

A designated representative in this process is a critical part of improving access to pesticide information for workers in various situations. There are times when a worker may need the help of a spouse, family member, or co-worker to obtain information. For instance, if a worker is injured or hurt and cannot be there in person, the information could be requested by the treating medical personnel. This standard is in practice in other sectors where workers are exposed to toxic substances and is consistent with the access to exposure records that those workers now have.

To protect the health of those who harvest the food for our constituents and put it on our tables, it is critical to have a uniform Federal standard that applies to all workers, and that is the right to have a designated representative.

In the amendment that I offer, I would simply strike section 437 in order to protect farmworkers' rights and also provide health protections.

I urge my colleagues to support the Grijalva-Sanchez amendment to strike section 437. This amendment is important to the health and safety of farmworkers and their families. We must ensure that farmworkers can appropriately access information on pesticides so they can protect themselves and their families while doing their jobs that are so vital to our Nation and to our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, prior to finalizing the worker protection rule, the EPA shared a draft with the House Committee on Agriculture. The draft did not contain a section that authorized the use of designated representatives. It was later inserted by the EPA without congressional consultation, and the EPA failed to follow the law that requires consultation with the authorizers on these pesticide rules.

However, the broader concern is the substance of the rule. Farmers are concerned they will have little recourse but to turn over their documents to unauthorized individuals. The section of the rule is ill-advised, and unintended consequences were clearly not considered. The EPA needs to reengage with the authorizing committee and the agricultural community on this.

In the meantime, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, at the urging of many organizations, and

at the urging of being consistent and uniform with the protections extended to workers who work with toxic substances throughout this country, which includes the provision that a representative may represent the interests, seek information, and provide transparency for that worker in order for them to pursue their health and their safety.

I think this section, the worker protection section, if we strike this section, all we are doing is making the process uniform for every industry. To deny farmworkers, and more particularly children, as I mentioned, that is the only workplace sector in which the child labor laws do not apply, to provide them, their families, and children with the simple ability to be treated like every other worker, in every other industry, that deals with toxic substances, I think, is just merely playing a fair game, treating all workers equally, and in this instance, this amendment would be consistent with what is going on in the rest of the Nation and the protections extended to all workers.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an excellent amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 157, line 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment, along with my colleagues, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM.

It is a very simple amendment. It just strikes a policy rider, section 439 of the bill. This section would block the EPA from doing its job. It would block the EPA's commonsense standards for sources of emissions of methane in the oil and gas industry, an

issue that is literally in our backyards in the State of Colorado.

It would even prevent the EPA from doing research into existing drill sites for methane standard purposes, and, most astonishing, it would actually prevent the EPA from clarifying the scope of emission sources, which would continue to make sure that we know less and are less protected rather than more protected.

The President and the EPA are taking action to protect our country, our planet, from methane emissions. It is past time that we take bold action to combat climate change and reduce the impact of impending catastrophic changes to our climate, to our world, reducing national security and hurting our economy in tourism and agriculture-dependent districts like mine. Taking aggressive action now is, quite simply, a moral imperative, not only within the purview of the EPA, but the actual charge that Congress is giving the Environmental Protection Agency.

The sad reality is that right now, the majority of our energy still comes from fossil fuels. That is why while of course we need to invest in renewables, at the same time, we can't wait to transition entirely to renewable energy before we address the extraction process that releases dangerous chemicals, such as methane as a by-product. Pound for pound, methane pollution from oil and gas wells is 80 times more potent than carbon dioxide and is responsible for one-quarter of human-made climate change, according to scientists.

These EPA rules are long overdue standards for the oil and gas industry, which will reduce methane pollution and provide certainty for the industry. Although I wish, frankly, these new rules went further, I wish, frankly, that Congress had taken bold action, these stricter standards are a good start, and they are necessary. Scientists have recently published even more convincing data showing that the methane released during natural gas extraction is a deadly climate threat.

New scientific mapping shows that 12.4 million people live within a half mile of the 1.2 million active oil and gas facilities in the United States, many in my home of Colorado. This threat radius is a very conservative estimate of the distance from which toxic air emissions from oil and gas facilities have an adverse impact on public health. It is why in many areas of northern Colorado and Wyoming, we have worse air quality than downtown Los Angeles.

We must not prevent the EPA from moving forward to protect our air, our water, and our planet, which is what Congress has charged them to do. It is time for us to allow them to do their science-based work. It is time to make the fossil fuel industry and fracking play by the same set of rules the rest of the country plays by, instead of letting them emit tons of chemicals, literally tons of chemicals into our air that put our health and the future of the planet in jeopardy.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in May, EPA issued regulations for new and existing oil and gas operations. These are the latest steps in the President's climate agenda. EPA pulled the rug out from underneath these companies, working in good faith to share information with the Agency. The industry was making tremendous progress to reduce emissions through voluntary measures. By any measurable degree, they were making tremendous progress.

But this administration feels the need to overregulate the oil and gas industry at every single turn, to use their police powers to bring this industry to their knees. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, voluntary measures are just that, voluntary. While there might, and perhaps there are a few good actors willing to abide by them in some States, like my home State of Colorado, have implemented air standards. What we care about is the aggregate. We want to discourage a race to the bottom among producers and have a national baseline for methane emissions.

While, again, frankly, I think this rule should go a lot further, at least it provides that baseline, provides the industry certainty, and helps begin the process of us getting a handle on ensuring that the air we breathe is clean and reducing climate change.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Just two amendments ago we had something called the social cost of carbon. Well, yes, the administration has now put out a new methane rule. Guess what. Social cost of methane is now being put forth as the economic justification for their rules.

I pointed out just a moment ago that despite the OMB's circular recommending a certain discount rate, unfortunately when running the numbers, apparently the Agency doesn't get the results they want, so what they do is change the underlying assumptions.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would remove a critical provision to protect against new, expansive methane regulations that could harm the economy, would harm the economy, and strangle our domestic energy portfolio. These regulations are being developed using the same overly aggressive interpretation of the Clean Air Act that was responsible for the costly, burdensome Clean Power Plan.

What is interesting on this one, however, is that even the EPA found that the methane rule would provide only marginal benefits. But they plow ahead regardless of that finding. I urge the opposition to this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, you can't just pretend that things don't have costs. Of course, carbon emissions have a cost. Of course, methane emissions have a cost. It doesn't mean that people are proposing we abolish carbon emissions from our economy. It means we want to look at, in this case, methane emissions and their cost. Colorado has implemented similar rules already that the industry has adopted. There are actors in the industry who want this very certainty so they know what they need to do with regard to methane emissions. There are plenty of companies providing new recapture technologies.

All this does is begin to get a handle on it. Again, in my opinion, it doesn't go far enough. In my opinion, it isn't the kind of action I would hope a bold Congress would take. But at the very least, let's have standards for methane emissions. Let's prevent a ban on research into existing drill sites for methane standard purposes.

If this section is left intact, not only does it strike the emission standards, it prevents the EPA from doing research into what the standards should be or could be, so we are never going to reach "the right answer." It should be beholden on those who believe that this is not the right answer to actually support the very kind of research for methane standard purposes that is blocked by this very section, which our amendment will remove from the bill. I ask for your support on this simple, commonsense amendment to remove this policy rider and help keep our air clean.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, strike lines 13 through 16.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike a misguided policy rider that could cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and it maintains a sweetheart, below-market deal for the fossil fuel industry.

My amendment would strike section 440 of the underlying bill, a section that would prevent the Interior Department from updating royalty rates and valuation methodologies for coal, oil, and natural gas resources on public lands.

Now, I would think that saving the taxpayer money by charging a fair return for the development of our public resources is something that both sides of the aisle could agree upon. So maybe the sponsors behind this policy rider didn't know the true magnitude of the cost to taxpayers that their rider to this appropriations bill would impose upon Americans.

To make sure that we all understand, Mr. Chair, what we would be costing the taxpayer if we were to vote to keep this harmful rider, Mr. Chair, I would like to share some eye-opening research on this matter.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, just released in April a detailed study that reviewed possible changes to the oil and gas fiscal system. That report explicitly analyzed how much money the American taxpayer is losing from the current below-market onshore oil and gas royalty rates.

CBO concluded that the U.S. Treasury would receive \$200 million additional and the Western States another \$200 million over 10 years if the Interior Department were to simply raise the onshore royalty rates to parity with the current offshore royalty rates.

So, to be clear, keeping this misguided policy rider would prevent an additional \$200 million from being sent to the Western States and another \$200 million to the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I have also heard specious arguments that claim raising onshore royalty rates will decrease production, put all oil and gas companies out of business and actually reduce the return to the taxpayer. This is false, and here is why: The CBO analyzed these effects and found that this was not the case. The CBO found that the effects on production would be negligible, and that the increases in Federal and State revenues are net increases that include the decreases in income from bonus bids and production changes. Furthermore, production would not simply move to State or private lands to find lower royalty rates because private mineral owners and Western States, like Wyoming, New

Mexico, Louisiana, North Dakota, Montana, even Oklahoma and Texas, all of them charge higher royalty rates.

Thus, I hope these facts will disabuse those who used to believe in keeping onshore oil and gas royalty rates below market price, and now will, instead, support the Lowenthal amendment No. 34 that will allow the Interior Department to provide the taxpayer and Western States with hundreds of millions of dollars in additional revenue.

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

□ 2100

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, we included a provision in this prohibiting the Department of the Interior from changing royalty rates in its valuation regulation for coal, oil, and gas on Federal land in order to stem the hemorrhaging of jobs we are seeing in coal country and throughout the United States.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment to strike the language that would defund the administration's efforts to kill coal, oil, and gas development.

My colleagues and I included this language for good reason. We are trying to protect our schools, our infrastructure, our communities, and the very livelihoods that depend on these revenues.

I know that royalty and valuation mean very little outside these walls, but to my constituents across Montana, it means funding schools and empowering local communities.

Mike Johnson, an operating engineer from Billings, I think sums it up best:

I am a working man from Montana. I am not a doctor or a lawyer or anything, but I personally suffered from the Federal mismanagement of our public lands in western Montana. I am a displaced worker from a paper mill. I now work in eastern Montana, and people don't understand the impact these jobs have on our lives. I saw five about five of my friends commit suicide after the mill closed. My wife had cancer, and I lost my health care, and I lost darn good-paying jobs.

The chairman of the great Crow Nation, Old Coyote, said:

A war on coal is a war on the Crow people.

Without Crow revenue, without revenue from coal, the Crow people faced a lifetime of despair and poverty. They have very few options but coal. Yet, this administration, at every turn, tries to prevent the Crow Nation from being sovereign and from having their choice to export and use their resource as they want. These words capture the real problem, and the cost is real people.

I know that many don't understand where Montana is. Montana is the same size as from here to Chicago, plus 2 miles. I understand Montana. I understand that Montana is blessed with re-

sources, and we want to use them in a responsible way. But I also have to protect our families, our ability to provide a living in Montana.

For this reason, I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment and stand with American workers, families, and the great Crow Nation.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, we heard a very passionate plea that this amendment of mine would hurt jobs, would hurt schools, would kill coal. It is just the opposite.

As I pointed out, the CBO's report just indicated that production would not go down. In fact, the largest impact upon production, the dominant factor that controls production, is the price of crude oil and natural gas, not the royalty rates.

I also would like to remind those on the other side of the aisle that States like Montana already at the State level and also on private property charge much higher than we are asking at the Federal level.

I would agree to the same charge that Montana charges residents for its own oil and gas and coal production.

Mr. Chairman, I request an "aye" vote on this very reasonable amendment that really brings money back to both States and also to the Federal Treasury.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting. We hear the devastating effects from people who represent these States that are rich in natural resources and what is happening in coal country and to the oil industry and the rest. I respect their opinion and I, obviously, oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114-683.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NOS. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, AND 40 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA EN BLOC

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40 printed in House Report 114-683, be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 162, beginning on line 14, strike section 447.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 166, beginning on line 19, strike section 448.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 172, beginning on line 4, strike section 449.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 182, beginning on line 18, strike section 450.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 182, beginning on line 24, strike section 451.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 183, beginning on line 3, strike section 452.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am submitting an amendment to strike provisions from Mr. VALADAO's bill, H.R. 2898, that were included as riders in this year's Interior and EPA appropriations bill.

I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues continue to attach bad policy on important appropriations bills. In this case, they have attached the same damaging riders to the Interior appropriations bill that would drain the California delta with over pumping. These provisions would ravage the ecology of the delta, destroy the local fish and wildlife, and harm communities we serve.

They would undermine 40 years of progress in protecting our land and resources. They override environmental protection for California rivers, fisheries, threatening thousands of fishing jobs, and weaken the Endangered Species Act. Fish will go extinct. But my Republican colleagues claim that this bill will not harm fish.

These sections violate existing biological opinions protecting salmon and other endangered fish, which would impact the salmon industry across the entire Pacific Coast.

These riders do nothing to prepare our communities for droughts in the future. These are droughts we know are coming. They misstate California water law and encourage further regional divides in the West when we need to work together to bridge those differences.

H.R. 2898 has been opposed by the State and key stakeholders, including commercial and sport fishermen, Native American tribes, environmental groups, and recreational employers. And the Obama administration has already threatened to veto it, but my Republican colleagues keep claiming that water is being wasted.

Hydrological conditions have played a primary role in water deliveries since the start of California's drought. The 2014 water year was the third driest in California's recorded history, and some experts conclude that the current drought may be the State's most severe in 1,200 years.

Currently, 100 percent of the State is experiencing some level of drought, and more than 40 percent is experiencing "exceptional drought," the most severe drought classification according to the U.S. Drought Monitor.

The Department of the Interior estimates that the Endangered Species Act accounted for a mere 2 percent of the water supply reduction in the Central Valley Project water deliveries in 2014, and current estimates suggest a similarly small impact in 2014. California's State Water Resources Control Board estimated that in 2015, only 2 percent of this water flowed out to the ocean solely for environmental protection.

The water that Donald Trump said was being shoved out to sea was actually used to prevent saltwater intrusion that would permanently damage some of the most valuable farmland in the world. Water being released for salinity control protects Central Valley farms from being contaminated.

California and Federal officials have been able to increase exports from the California delta using existing authority. This action has helped maximize the use of what little water exists in the State. A lack of water is our biggest threat, not operational flexibility. And my colleagues still wonder where some of that water went.

Well, according to the Bay Institute, earlier this year, approximately two-thirds of storm runoff was captured or diverted, with only one-third of the runoff making it through the delta estuary. And for the period of October 1 of last year to January 31, 60 percent of storm water was diverted or stored.

Water scarcity in California is caused by longstanding and severe drought and the slow pace of investments in efficiency, water recycling, and other supplies. Many senior water right holders have received 100 percent of their allocation this year. According to State law, they are supposed to get that amount. The other junior right holders got much less, but that is what it means to be a junior water right holder—you don't get as much water in a drought.

California has the right to stop seawater intrusion, protect water quality for our communities and farms, and distribute allocations according to their water right system. Even the junior water right holders have proven their resiliency. In fact, the National Agriculture Statistics Service projects a record almond crop in California this year. The orchards will yield an estimated 2.05 billion pounds, up from an even 2 billion the year before. It would eclipse the record.

I am deeply disappointed this bill has been included in this year's Interior ap-

propriations bill, and I hope my amendment passes to strike out these harmful provisions.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, we all know there has been a drought in California, except for this year. This year, we have had some relief from the historic drought conditions that have been certainly made worse by Federal actions, which have, undoubtedly, led to increased pressure on California's ability to provide water throughout the State.

I have been following the flows of water through the delta virtually every day. I remember one day there was 185,000 cubic feet per second moving through the delta. And for whatever reason, decisions were made to only pump 2,500 cubic feet per second when you are allowed under the biological opinion to pump 5,000. I am just going to give that as one example.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who has been working very hard in the Central Valley for the farms and his constituents.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, 380 million gallons a day; that is a number that should have been quoted. When you hear about 380 million gallons a day of sewage being dumped in this estuary that they talk about, this environment they are trying to protect, when you think about that much sewage being dumped into the delta on a daily basis, you hear the same people talking about trying to protect it.

There are things going on in that delta. And they have been restricting our water for the last 20 years, and it has not saved that species. There are provisions in these bills that actually help. We attacked the invasive species that is attacking the delta smelt, the striped bass. We have offered that provision many times.

We are offering many solutions. Like the author mentioned earlier, we have had language in probably five different pieces of legislation going through the House over to the Senate. We have begged for an open and transparent process where we can debate this and have some commonsense ideas brought forward and voted and signed into law so that we can help both our communities.

If you truly care about the delta, stop polluting it. If you truly care about the people of California and what it costs to feed your families, if you truly care about farm workers, if you truly care about these small communities, you would care about water and doing this right and having an honest debate.

Now, I have been approached off camera a million times now to have an-

other off-camera conversation about this, and we have said all along: No more conversation like that. Everything on the floor. This is an open, transparent process. Five pieces of legislation have this language in it. And we are going to continue to push until we can get some support so we can fix this problem.

□ 2115

So those little communities in my district that people claim to care about could actually turn on a faucet and fill a pot of water so they can make themselves some food to eat and some dinner, maybe bathe their children, because that is where we are today. We have houses that, when they turn on a faucet, they no longer have water.

And I get the whole junior water rights concern, but if they were truly concerned about the environment, they would give up some of their water. But you look at Hetch Hetchy, that has had 100 percent of their water and continues to deliver that water via pipeline all the way to San Francisco without one conversation about that water being able to help some of these rivers and some of these species, but they are not willing to give up any of their water. They are willing to take other people's water. It is the same thing we hear about on so many different issues; take someone else's product, or someone else's water and try to solve another problem with it.

And the problem has to be solved the right way: language that we have offered, that has been offered into these amendments, into these bills, and that we have pushed over to the Senate, and the conversation has to be had in an open, transparent process like our Senators have told us they wanted.

So we are here. We are ready for that conversation. We want an honest debate, and we want to talk about the way we actually fix these problems.

We are not going to try to accommodate communities dumping their sewage in the delta, but we want to help those species, and there is language in there to do that, even language in there to help capture some of the water. Use some of the infrastructure we have paid for as taxpayers and allow it to be used to its full capacity so we can continue to store water that we do have and not waste it.

This is an honest piece of language that could actually help solve California's problems, and I think we need to continue to have an honest debate.

Mr. CALVERT. Obviously, this is an emotional subject. It is not just water that is going to the Central Valley, also to the southern California region for the millions of people who live there.

We don't want to see water wasted. This year, we saw hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water being released through the delta, really, with not saving one fish. Even independent agencies will privately agree that they were overly conservative

when they were managing the pump operations of late.

So this suffering that is going on is terrible. It needs to come to an end. I certainly oppose this amendment and urge a "no" vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 183, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 184, line 15.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike section 453 from the underlying bill.

Section 453 restricts funds from being used to establish a national monument pursuant to the Antiquities Act in several Western counties, including Maricopa County in Arizona, a portion of which I represent in Congress.

I understand the Member who inserted this language into the bill during committee consideration is generally opposed, if not totally opposed, to the use of the Antiquities Act.

This section restricts the use of the Antiquities Act on over 160 million acres of public land, nearly one-quarter of all Federal land in the lower 48. I know that many of the Members of Congress who represent these areas do not support this blanket restriction on the use of the Antiquities Act.

So that we are absolutely clear, these monuments can be established only on land already owned by the Federal Government. This is how Federal lands should be preserved. It is not about adding more land to the Federal estate.

Since Theodore Roosevelt's designation of the first national monument, Devils Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America's best known and most loved landscapes; only 3 Presidents have not.

America's public places are becoming more and more inclusive, more rep-

resentative of all Americans, and as President Obama has demonstrated with the use of the Antiquities Act, more representative of the real reality, history, culture, and special places of this Nation that represent all people. That is why, presently, I am working with the region's Native American communities and, in earnest, I have asked the President to designate the Greater Grand Canyon Heritage National Monument on public land surrounding the Grand Canyon.

Section 435 of this bill will jeopardize not only that effort, but other efforts around the country to honor, recognize, and protect our most cherished cultural, historic, and natural resources, and it should be removed from the bill.

I urge my colleagues to stand up in defense of the Antiquities Act and support my amendment to strike Section 435 from this bill.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, some 20 years ago, President Clinton went to Arizona and he pointed across the border into Utah, in my district, and he said: I'm creating a national monument over there—nearly 2 million acres.

He did not have the courage to come to Utah to defend this monument nor to create it because he knew that the local people did not support it. That monument has been incredibly unpopular since then. It has kicked ranchers off the range. It has decimated the local economies, until we have reached this point, where some of the local school districts have had to declare an emergency because their schools are dying and their children are having to ride a bus for 2 hours, one way, 2 hours, to go to school. Why? Because there are no jobs that can support a family, and people are having to leave.

Local input is so important to the creation of these monuments, and there are examples where local input and where people collaborating have worked together and come to a great solution. ROB BISHOP has done that. Just yesterday, we held a bipartisan press conference where we had local mayors, Republicans and Democrats, on what we called the Mountain Accord.

I am asking President Obama, please, come to my State. Talk to the people in my district. See what they think about this monument. Come talk to us and see how this will impact them.

Now, let me close with this. There is a reason I live in Utah. I love to ski. I love to rock climb. I love to hike. I love to sit on my porch and look at the

beautiful landscape around me. I want to preserve this. All of us do. But there is a right way to do this and there is a wrong way to do this, and the Antiquities Act and the stroke of a pen of a President who won't even come to the State to defend his action is not the right way.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding the time.

I really want to support this important amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona. It is important because it will strike a section of this bill that will hurt a small group of States, including my State of Maine.

As we all know, the Congress gave the President the right to create a national monument over 100 years ago. Since then, the President has used that authority to create national monuments like Yellowstone, Grand Canyon National Park, and Acadia National Park in my district.

National monuments bring economic benefits to States, and the use of the Antiquities Act has been an important conservation tool for over a century. For my State of Maine, a national monument would bring new visitors to the area and create jobs, not just in the immediate region, but throughout the State.

For example, we already have a national park in Maine, Acadia National Park. Acadia started out as a national monument 100 years ago this very month, and it brings about 3 million visitors a year to the region.

Mr. Chair, this bill has very problematic language in that it will block the creation of national monuments, even in areas where one might be supported by our local communities. We need to strip this provision out of the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support the Grijalva amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, Congressman GRIJALVA, who represents southwestern Arizona, is seeking to lock up 1.7 million acres in northern Arizona, at the behest of special interest groups, for the sole purpose of preventing mining, retiring grazing permits, closing roads to OHV users, and preventing forest thinning activities. There is significant opposition in Arizona to this proposed land grab, as Americans for Responsible Recreational Access recently reported that a scientific poll found that 71.6 percent of Arizonans are opposed.

In April, I held a public meeting to hear concerns about this proposal, and hundreds of local stakeholders showed up in opposition. More than 30 Arizona witnesses submitted formal testimony against this land grab, including Arizona's Governor, the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, numerous businesses, sportsmen's groups, ag

groups, local officials, and countless taxpayers. In fact, several of the comments pertaining to today are out of line.

In fact, in this proposal, the entire town of Tusayan, which is in Coconino County, would be swallowed up by this proposed monument. Town managers testified against it.

Arizona State Land Department Commissioner Lisa Atkins submitted testimony stating: "Of the 1.7 million acres included in the proposal for the Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument, 64,000 acres belong solely to the Common Schools beneficiary: K-12 education."

The list goes on and on and on. I asked everybody. In fact, Arizona Governor Doug Ducey stated: "Imposition of a preservation management objective overlay on 1.7 million acres of land in Arizona thwarts Arizona's land management objectives and values, and it does so by bypassing a public process that would most certainly result in a much more thoughtful result. The Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument is not narrow, targeted, warranted, or being considered through an open cooperative public process."

I, last but not least, bring up that attorneys also have testified that this proposed monument will tie up future surface water use and future groundwater use.

I urge a "no" vote on amendment 41.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, is there any time left for the opposition?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment.

I represent the heart of the Las Vegas Valley, which attracts more than 42 million visitors from around the globe every year to the world famous Strip to visit our first-class casinos, restaurants, shopping, and shows.

But that is not the only reason people come to Nevada. They come to see the West as it was hundreds, even thousands, of years ago. They come to see the iconic bighorn sheep, the Joshua tree, the petroglyphs that tell the history of the first people who called southern Nevada home.

Congress rightfully entrusted in the President the authority to designate such special places for protection, but this bill would eliminate his or her ability to do that, to protect those places that tell America's stories.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment to strip out this section from the bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say, since the item came up of the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon is an icon to this whole Nation and is supported overwhelmingly by public opinion to create a

monument that protects it from degradation from uranium mining, that protects the watershed that feeds water to 23 million people across the West, Nevada, California, Arizona. To say that this is merely a grabbing and a taking is to misrepresent history, misrepresent the reality of that resource; and, in the long term, understand that this icon, the Grand Canyon, is there to be preserved and protected by this Congress, not to be turned over for exploitation.

I urge support of the amendment to protect the prerogatives of not only a President, but the prerogatives of our natural resources to be protected in perpetuity for generations and generations to come.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce section 1037.601(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under the proposed rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles-Phase 2" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on July 13, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 40138 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance, with respect to glider kits and glider vehicles (as defined in section 1037.801 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under such proposed rule).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect American workers and small manufacturing businesses from a misguided provision in a proposed EPA rule. Last year, the EPA released its phase 2 fuel efficiency and emissions standard for new medium- and heavy-duty trucks.

While many in the trucking industry are not opposed to the phase 2 rule as a whole, one section in the proposal wrongly applies these standards to what are known as glider kits.

A glider kit is a group of vehicle parts that can include a brand new truck frame, cab, or axles, but which does not include an engine or transmission. Since a glider kit is less expensive to purchase than a new heavy-duty truck and can extend the investment and working life of a truck, businesses and drivers with a damaged or older vehicle may choose to purchase a glider kit instead of buying a new one.

Glidens extend the useful life of truck engines while frequently having a higher resale price against comparable trucks. Due to their rebuilt engines, they can also often be a more fuel-efficient option, allowing trucking companies and drivers to use less fuel.

Unfortunately, the EPA is proposing to apply the new phase 2 standards to glider kits even though gliders are not really new vehicles. Further, it is unclear whether the EPA even has the authority to regulate the replacement parts like gliders. While the EPA's stated goal with phase 2 is to reduce emissions, the agency has not studied the emissions impact of remanufactured engines and gliders compared to new vehicles.

It appears the agency's actual motivation is to force businesses and drivers that would like to use glider kits to instead buy new trucks. Applying the phase 2 standards to glider kits would certainly harm the workers and owners in the glider industry, leading to possible closure of these businesses and job losses at both manufacturers and dealerships. Additionally, the EPA's rule would limit consumer choice in the marketplace. Under this proposal, many operators and businesses would simply choose to continue using current vehicles, leaving older trucks on the road longer.

My amendment would protect these businesses and American manufacturing jobs by prohibiting the EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or even enforcing phase 2 standards on glider kits.

To be clear, this amendment would not—and I repeat, would not—bar the EPA from implementing the whole phase 2 rule for medium and heavy-duty trucks. It would simply clarify that glider kits and glider vehicles are not new trucks as the EPA claims.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to help support American manufacturing and stop the EPA from attempting to shut down the glider industry.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, last year, the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued proposed fuel efficiency standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks as required by the Energy Independence and Security Act.

This amendment would prohibit EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing this proposed rule or any rule of the same substance with respect to glider vehicles. These new standards are designed to improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution to reduce the impact of climate change.

To be specific, Mr. Chair, these standards are expected to lower CO₂ emissions by roughly 1 billion metric tons, cut fuel costs by \$170 million, and reduce oil consumption by up to 1.8 billion barrels over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program. Now, heavy-duty trucks account for 5 percent of the vehicles on the road, and yet they create 20 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions created by all transportation sectors.

I would note for my colleagues that this amendment doesn't actually suspend all aspects of the new rule; it simply carves out an exemption for one particular industry, the industry that produces what are known as glider vehicles.

Glider vehicles are heavy-duty vehicles that place an older or remanufactured engine on a new truck chassis. These are engines that date back to 2001 or older. They have emissions that are 20 to 40 times higher than today's clean diesel engines.

In essence, Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow an entire segment of the truck manufacturing industry to avoid compliance with the new criteria pollutant standards that are in the rule. These are engines that will continue to emit greenhouse gases and slow down our progress in reducing the impacts of climate change. In short, Mr. Chair, this amendment creates a loophole that you could drive a truck through by allowing dirty engines to continue to pollute our environment.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) the chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding that the overall rule is supported broadly by many in the truck and the manufacturing industry. However, as any rule, there are some specifics that do need to be ironed out, and my colleague has narrowly tailored this amendment to address concerns within the EPA's rule. So you really can't drive a truck through it.

I support this language in the Interior bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to vote "aye" on this amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, this proposed language from the EPA is improper and ill-conceived with no regard to jobs. If the EPA is going to promulgate rules that raise the costs and hurt jobs in districts like mine, the least they can do is to have a few facts prepared to back them.

Communities where these kits are manufactured are already struggling with above average unemployment, and would see more job opportunities put out of reach.

Furthermore, there seems to have been little time for the glider industry to even respond and to have little to no economic consideration given prior.

Our constituent, dealers and employees, glider truck owners and operators, and remanufacturing businesses will disproportionately be affected by the EPA's decision to effectively ban the products that they sell, service, and drive. The U.S. truck industry has been a bright spot in the recovery of the national economy, and applying new standards to the gliders would increase expenses for our businesses and their drivers.

Congress has recognized the value of remanufactured parts and components. The United States Senate and House of Representatives have voted overwhelmingly in support of legislation, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, which was signed into law just last year, to encourage Federal agencies to consider using remanufactured parts in the Federal vehicle fleet. So it is happening in the Federal Government. This is going to affect the private sector.

To restrict the usage of manufactured engines under this rulemaking appears to be counter to the congressional intent.

I will reiterate that gliders, by definition, aren't a motor vehicle, and they therefore should be used outside the EPA's authority.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I would just restate that this amendment creates a loophole. It creates a loophole for one industry. It picks winners and losers. The winners would be one segment of the truck industry. The losers would be jobs, our health, and our environment.

Mr. Chair, I ask for opposition to this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition. I want to begin by saying I think the committee has done an amazing job with consistently making reductions in what they are spending. It is appropriate that we do that because we are \$19.3 trillion in debt.

My amendment is a very simple reduction in spending. It is a penny out of a dollar—1 percent—across the board. I know it is not popular. I know everybody says it goes too far. But this will save us \$321 million—of course, not a lot when you look at the total budget, but it is very appropriate that we begin to take these steps.

I think it is so interesting talking about Ronald Reagan and how he approached things. He would always say: Let's take a little bit, a few steps at a time and begin to get behind some of this and get our economy and get our government back in shape, right-size it.

That is exactly what he did, and it paid off for our country with economic growth, making certain that our economy was growing, and that our revenues were growing. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, since that time, we have seen our country doesn't have a revenue problem. What we have is a spending problem. What we have is a priority problem. What we fail to do time and time again is to realize that the taxpayers tell us they are overtaxed, our government is overspent, and they want us to consistently make as many spending reductions as we possibly can.

So I come, once again, to the floor with this 1 percent across-the-board spending cut. What it will do is to make that reduction of another \$321 million to build on the success the committee has already shown with coming \$64 million below the 2016 enacted levels. They are to be commended for that. But let's get in behind it. Let's compound these savings and begin to get our fiscal house in order.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our colleagues will be treated to a rare display of bipartisan harmony on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose the amendment.

Look, this is not a perfect bill, and there are clear differences on this amendment, but we should not be underfunding what, in my view, is already underfunded. If this amendment were to pass, we are looking at fewer patients that would be seen at the Indian Health Service, fewer safety inspectors ensuring that accidents do not occur, and deferred maintenance on our Nation's drinking water and sanitation infrastructure. More generally, Mr. Chairman, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands will be halted, and jobs will be lost.

The bill is already underfunded in my view, and this amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force agencies and our constituents to do less with less. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman's amendment and her intent to reduce spending. As she well knows, we have reduced this bill somewhat over the years, as we have on all of the discretionary accounts that the Appropriations Committee is responsible for.

This really is a decision based upon discussion regarding discretionary accounts versus nondiscretionary accounts. If we could have cut the nondiscretionary accounts as much as we have cut discretionary accounts, we could probably balance the budget plus. But unfortunately, we are not there.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment. I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayer dollars, but this is not an approach I can support. While the President's proposed budget exceeds the bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes the tough choices with an allocation that adheres to the current law.

We may not agree that it is enough, but that is what the current law is. So we made trade-offs, and we have done many difficult choices to make this work.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment.

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

□ 2145

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard every excuse that there is—always do—and I know that spending reductions are not popular around here. I get it. I know it. But let me tell you what I think also is not proper.

I think that it is immoral for us to spend money that we don't have—it is not our money; it is taxpayer money—and to spend it on programs that our constituents don't want.

I think it is also immoral for us to not get our spending under control and to pass along all this debt to our children and our grandchildren. Just think about it. My grandsons, who are 7 and 8 years old, by the time they begin paying taxes, these programs, many of them, will have outlived their usefulness. The utilization of these dollars will be gone.

Do I hope we have the political will to look at the mandatory spending side of the column? Absolutely.

A couple of other points. I would hope that bipartisanship will come to reducing what we spend in this Chamber, that there will be agreement that we are, indeed, overtaxed and overspent, and the fiscal health of this Nation needs to be addressed.

I also think that what we need to look at is the burden of taxation has caused many of our constituents to face deferred maintenance on their homes, on their businesses, on their dreams, because they are having to pay their taxes, they are having to pay what the Federal Government takes out of those paychecks, first right of refusal on those paychecks. It also causes job loss.

It is time for us to address our overspending and our national debt. I do hope we see some work on the mandatory side of the column.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman notes that it is the taxpayers' money. She is right, it is the taxpayers' money. Taxpayers expect that their money will be spent safeguarding their infrastructure. They expect that their money will be spent on maintenance, maintaining their infrastructure. They expect that their money will be spent making sure that when they turn on the faucets in Flint, Michigan, toxic water doesn't come out. They expect that if they have health problems, they will be able to get some monitoring and that their health will be taken care of. They expect us to spend their dollars wisely.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill. But the chairman is correct, this bill adheres to the law. While we would say we are not investing enough, and while the chairman would say we are investing about what we have, the gentleman's amendment would actually force us to do much less with even less.

Those are not priorities we can support, Mr. Chairman, which is why I urge my colleagues to join the chairman and our ranking member in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement, administer, or enforce any rule or guidance of the same substance as the proposed rule regarding Risk Management, Financial Assurance and Loss Prevention for which advanced notice of proposed rulemaking was published by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management on August 19, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 49027) or the National Notice to Lessees and Operators of Federal Oil and Gas and Sulphur Leases, Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) issued by such Bureau (NTL No. 2016-N03).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of implementation, administering, or enforcing any rule or guidance similar to the proposed guidance that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released regarding financial assurances for oil and gas operations on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The Federal Government currently requires American offshore oil and gas companies to buy liability bonds ranging from tens of thousands of dollars to tens of millions of dollars for every offshore lease. In August of 2014, BOEM published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking industry input on "risk management, financial assurance, and loss prevention."

Inexplicably, BOEM elected to circumvent the rulemaking process it initiated and, instead, released proposed guidance in August 2015 that creates new rules that will change the way the oil and gas industry funds these decommissioning costs—also referred to as "plugging" or "abandonment"—of wells, pipelines, and other facilities in the Gulf of Mexico's Outer Continental Shelf.

The Obama administration ignored warnings from stakeholders that this proposed guidance could drive many companies into bankruptcy precisely at a time when the industry is suffering from a commodity price collapse. A lot of workers in Louisiana

and across the Gulf Coast have been laid off.

BOEM has asserted that these rule changes are necessary to prevent taxpayers from being left with the tab for decommissioning work in light of a number of recent bankruptcy filings by OCS shelf operators. Ironically, BOEM's solution will likely trigger the major risk that it is trying to protect against. If implemented, these changes will pose an existential threat to many OCS shelf operators, discourage future investment, cost thousands of jobs, and dramatically reduce the royalties to U.S. taxpayers.

For example, under the new rules, each party would be assessed 100 percent on shared leases, and a joint operating agreement is no longer accepted as a reflection of actual liability.

This means that if there are four companies sharing a project and it would cost an estimated \$20 million to remove that particular platform, BOEM would, nevertheless, require each party to post a \$20 million bond to remove the platform. It hardly seems necessary to require \$80 million in bonding for a \$20 million project.

The new rules also require full bonding up front for all possible wells in the exploratory plan, despite the fact that the wells may never be drilled. The P&A liability, in many cases, will not accrue for many, many years. For facilities already in production, BOEM will require capital assurance for the lifetime production value of the property every year, meaning that each year a lessee will be responsible for 100 percent of the P&A liability for every production facility exploration activity in production value.

In fact, many of the industry experts have expressed concern that BOEM has not even provided a clear definition of the problem that the agency is trying to solve nor has there been any justification provided as to the need for major changes to the existing regulatory framework. Experts throughout the industry remain concerned that if this proposed guidance were to be finalized, it would dramatically limit the industry's ability to successfully explore and extract oil and gas from the Gulf of Mexico.

A new rule, guidance, or any other form of notice from BOEM on supplemental bonding will stifle oil and gas production on the OCS and throughout the Gulf of Mexico. This is not in the interest of the United States.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would clearly block the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from finalizing guidance to clarify financial assurances for oil and gas companies operating in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The guidance is important because it details the procedures that will be used to determine the lessee's financial ability to carry out its obligations so that we, the taxpayer, our constituents, can be sure that the oil company can pay for all of its costs associated with offshore drilling. The guidance is necessary to ensure that oil companies have the financial capability to properly decommission outer shelf facilities instead of abandoning them and leaving the American taxpayer, our constituents, on the hook to pay the cost.

The guidance will modernize the financial assurance regulations to match the current industry practices, provide updated criteria for determining the lessee's ability to self-insure its liabilities based on the lessee's financial capacity and financial strength. We should be working together to ensure that the U.S. taxpayer never pays to decommission an OCS facility and that the environment is protected at the same time.

This amendment protects the special interests of Big Oil at the taxpayer's expense, so I must protect the taxpayer and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for bringing this amendment up.

Here is the reality. This is largely a solution in search of a problem. There has not been a single case in the history of offshore energy production where the government has been left holding the bag. It doesn't exist. So, yes, we should be working together. Representing one of the most ecologically productive coastal areas in the United States, we are very concerned about what happens with our coastal area.

But, again, we are proposing solutions in search of problems. All this is going to do is it is going to result in a decrease in competition for offshore energy production, a decrease in competition, and a decrease in revenue for the United States Treasury. This funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, something that your side often stands up for and fights for. This has provided nearly \$200 billion for the United States Treasury, one of the largest revenue streams for the United States Government outside of taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. This policy, this notice to lessees, is ill-advised. It simply has been done in the dark of night, and it is a solution in search of a problem.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, we need in this day and age to make sure

that the American taxpayer is protected. We have seen time and time again when environmental disasters happen and brownfields are left behind or what is going on in Flint, the taxpayer picks up the bill.

I just really believe that this guidance is necessary to ensure that oil companies have the financial capability—that they have on the books the financial capability to properly decommission their Outer Continental Shelf facilities instead of abandoning them, leaving the American taxpayer to pay for the cleanup.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement, administer, or enforce any rule of the same substance as the proposed rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Blowout Preventer Systems and Well Control" and published April 17, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 21504), the final rule issued by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement with that title (Docket ID: BSEE-2015-0002; 15XEL700DX EX15SF0000.DAQ000), or any rule of the same substance as such proposed or final rule.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will prohibit any money being spent for the implementation or enforcement of any rule or guidance similar to the well-controlled rule offered by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, or BSEE.

Unfortunately, according to experts throughout the oil and gas industry, many of the prescriptive requirements contained within the final well-controlled rule will neither improve safety nor reduce environmental risk in drilling, but will actually have unintended consequences of increasing risk beyond that of existing regulations.

Additionally, the final rule will create significant additional expenses and burdens for those engaged in exploration development and production activities on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Ultimately, these added economic and compliance cost tens of billions of

dollars over 10 years, and together with other regulatory burdens, they could force some smaller operators out of business and drive larger operators from the Federal OCS toward countries with less prescriptive regulatory environments or other opportunities. This means that the negative impacts of this destructive rule will likely be felt throughout all 50 States.

To my colleagues who represent States that do not have offshore development, I would argue that you should support this amendment because BSEE's well-controlled rule is yet another example of the Obama administration not listening to real experts in this industry and, instead, forcing rules and regulations into place that will hurt the domestic industry and our U.S. economy.

In effect, the well-controlled rule ultimately could increase risk and decrease safety on the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a one-size-fits-all proposal that really is not realistic.

□ 2200

It will also negatively impact the attractiveness of the Gulf of Mexico for future oil and gas investment, and it will likely result in oil and gas operators choosing to develop energy resources in other parts of the world, taking those jobs and those investment opportunities with them.

As the House's Task Forces on Reducing Regulatory Burdens and Restoring Constitutional Authority explains in its mission statement, we as a government should be working to "make it easier to invest, produce, and build in America with a modern and transparent regulatory system that relieves the burden on small businesses and other job creators and encourages financial independence while balancing environmental stewardship, public safety, and consumer interests."

BSEE's well control rule does not do this. America cannot continue to be the global energy leader without policies that foster this kind of innovation, investment, and development of our energy resources. Safety, not convenience, must always be the driving force behind these initiatives. BSEE'S well control rule not only leaves industry with numerous questions about compliance, but it also has experts concerned that these new measures will increase risk.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I am surprised this amendment is being offered because there is already a rider in the bill that pretty much accomplishes what the gentleman's amendment would do. Let's be clear what this amendment does.

It reverses the safety improvements that were developed following the

Deepwater Horizon tragedy. It would delay or prevent the implementation of a rule that was developed directly from the recommendations of numerous investigations. There was a full investigation. These are the recommendations from it. The investigations were conducted by industry experts, and they determined the actual cause of the Deepwater Horizon tragedy and the impact on the Gulf of Mexico and on the surrounding States and on the local communities, as we heard Ms. CASTOR from Florida talk about earlier.

Many of the requirements of this rule are not new. They were already in existence as industry standards, notice to lessees and guidance and equipment and operation requirements that were already part of the regulation. What the rule does is consolidates these requirements into one section and makes them enforceable—yes, enforceable. The Department of the Interior estimates that the regulation amendment blocks would prevent between \$657 million and \$4.4 billion of damage caused by well blowouts over 10 years.

Most importantly, this estimate does not take into account the human element of these protections. I think we can all agree that you cannot put a price on human life. The Deepwater Horizon was a tragic event. Eleven lives were lost in that explosion. It is unconscionable that this amendment, once again, looks to put the profits of big oil companies ahead of workers' safety; so I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding and also for bringing up this amendment.

Let's talk about reality versus fiction. Here is the reality.

The reality is that these regulations have not been out there. They were not subject to investigations and studies. I was the lead trustee for the State of Louisiana. I was the tip of the spear who was fighting BP during the entire Deepwater Horizon, and I was the natural resource manager for the coast of Louisiana under which over 600 miles of our coast was oiled.

I appreciate the gentleman for stepping in and trying to defend our environment and our resources. For the constituents whom I represent who lost family members, the reality is this: 60 percent of the wells since the Deepwater Horizon couldn't even be drilled under this proposed rule. The reality is that the Department of the Interior's cost estimate said it was going to cost \$883 million to comply with when a private study said it was going to be \$93 billion.

The reality is this: you have a bunch of bureaucrats who are sitting around in a vacuum who have no idea what they are doing and who are proposing things under the auspices of safety but that actually threaten the lives of our citizens in south Louisiana who are producing energy for this Nation—in fact, approximately 17 percent of the energy for the United States.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, in closing, that is why I do not understand the redundancy, the duplicity—why we keep doing this over and over and over again. This bill already undoes a lot of what the regulation would do to protect the environment and to protect workers' safety.

I read from the bill at page 69, line 4, section 124, and this is about drilling margins:

"None of the funds made available in this act or any other act for any fiscal year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to regulations and guidance." It goes on.

This amendment would reverse the safety improvements that were developed following the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, something to which, I think, America said no more: no more loss of life, no impact like this on our environment.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, in Louisiana, we understand quite clearly how good environmental policy, economic policy, energy policy march hand in hand. We also know that the men and women who work on these rigs are our friends, our neighbors, our family, and safety is first. We also know from experts across the industry that this proposed rule is a one-size-fits-all proposal that increases risk. It makes it more risky, and we will not stand to allow this rule to go forward. That is why I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HIMES of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NORCROSS of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment No. 12 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. BECERRA of California.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. PETERS of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 225, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—197

Adams	Cárdenas	Davis (CA)
Aguilar	Carney	Davis, Danny
Ashford	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Bass	Cartwright	DeGette
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Beyer	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bilirakis	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Blumenauer	Clay	Doggett
Bonamici	Cleaver	Doyle, Michael
Boyle, Brendan	Clyburn	F.
F.	Cohen	Duckworth
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Edwards
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Ellison
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Engel
Buchanan	Costello (PA)	Eshoo
Bustos	Courtney	Esty
Butterfield	Crowley	Farr
Capps	Cuellar	Fitzpatrick
Capuano	Cummings	Foster

Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Richmond	Perry	Russell	Walberg
Fudge	Loeb sack	Ros-Lehtinen	Peterson	Salmon	Walden
Gabbard	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard	Pittenger	Sanford	Walker
Gallego	Lowenthal	Ruiz	Pitts	Scalise	Walorski
Garamendi	Lowe	Ruppersberger	Pompeo	Schweikert	Walters, Mimi
Gibson	Lujan Grisham	Rush	Posey	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)
Graham	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Grayson	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda	Ratcliffe	Sessions	Wenstrup
Green, Al	(NM)	T.	Reed	Shimkus	Westerman
Green, Gene	Lynch	Sarbanes	Renacci	Shuster	Westmoreland
Grijalva	Maloney,	Schakowsky	Ribble	Simpson	Whitfield
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Schiff	Rice (SC)	Smith (MO)	Williams
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Schrader	Rigell	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Hanna	Matsui	Scott (VA)	Roby	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Heck (WA)	McCollum	Scott, David	Roe (TN)	Stewart	Womack
Higgins	McDermott	Serrano	Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Woodall
Himes	McGovern	Sewell (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Yoder
Hinojosa	McNerney	Sherman	Rohrabacher	Thornberry	Yoho
Honda	Meehan	Sinema	Rokita	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Hoyer	Meeks	Sires	Rooney (FL)	Tipton	Young (IN)
Huffman	Meng	Slaughter	Roskam	Trott	Young (IN)
Israel	Moore	Smith (NJ)	Ross	Turner	Zeldin
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Smith (WA)	Rothfus	Upton	Zinke
Jeffries	Murphy (FL)	Speier	Rouzer	Valadao	
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Stefanik	Royce	Wagner	
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)			
Jones	Neal	Takano			
Kaptur	Nolan	Thompson (CA)	Bishop (UT)	Jolly	Stutzman
Katko	Norcross	Thompson (MS)	Dold	Marino	Takai
Keating	Nugent	Titus	Foxx	Poe (TX)	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Tonko	Hastings	Sanchez, Loretta	
Kennedy	Pallone	Torres			
Kildee	Pascarell	Tsongas			
Kilmer	Payne	Van Hollen			
Kind	Pelosi	Vargas			
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Veasey			
Kuster	Peters	Vela			
Langevin	Pingree	Velázquez			
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Visclosky			
Larson (CT)	Poliquin	Walz			
Lawrence	Polis	Wasserman			
Lee	Price (NC)	Schultz			
Levin	Quigley	Waters, Maxine			
Lewis	Rangel	Watson Coleman			
Lieu, Ted	Reichert	Welch			
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth			

NOES—225

Abraham	Donovan	Jordan
Aderholt	Duffy	Joyce
Allen	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (MS)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	King (IA)
Babin	Emmer (MN)	King (NY)
Barletta	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Barr	Fincher	Kline
Barton	Fleischmann	Knight
Benishek	Fleming	Labrador
Bishop (MI)	Flores	LaHood
Black	Forbes	LaMalfa
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Blum	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Bost	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Boustany	Garrett	Long
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Brat	Gohmert	Love
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Lummis
Buck	Granger	MacArthur
Buchson	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Massie
Byrne	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Calvert	Griffith	McCaul
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McClintock
Carter (TX)	Guinta	McHenry
Chabot	Guthrie	McKinley
Chaffetz	Hardy	McMorris
Clawson (FL)	Harper	Rodgers
Coffman	Harris	McSally
Cole	Hartzler	Meadows
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	Messer
Collins (NY)	Hensarling	Mica
Comstock	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Cook	Hill	Moolenaar
Costa	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Cramer	Hudson	Mullin
Crawford	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Culberson	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Curbelo (FL)	Hunter	Newhouse
Davidson	Hurd (TX)	Noem
Davis, Rodney	Hurt (VA)	Nunes
Denham	Issa	Olson
Dent	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
DeSantis	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pearce

NOT VOTING—11

Bishop (UT)	Jolly	Stutzman
Dold	Marino	Takai
Foxx	Poe (TX)	Wilson (FL)
Hastings	Sanchez, Loretta	

□ 2229

Messrs. HANNA, GUTIÉRREZ, and FITZPATRICK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 417, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—183

Adams	Carney	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Ashford	Cartwright	DeGette
Bass	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Beatty	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Becerra	Chu, Judy	Dent
Benishek	Cicilline	Deutch
Bera	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Cleaver	F.
Bonamici	Clyburn	Duckworth
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Edwards
F.	Connolly	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Conyers	Engel
Brown (FL)	Cooper	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Esty
Bustos	Costello (PA)	Farr
Butterfield	Courtney	Foster
Capps	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Cuellar	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Gabbard

Gallego	Lofgren	Ruiz	Pittenger	Salmon	Visclosky	Hoyer	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Gibson	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Pitts	Sanford	Wagner	Huffman	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Graham	Lowe	Rush	Pompeo	Scalise	Walberg	Israel	McCollum	Scott, David
Grayson	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)	Posey	Schiff	Walden	Jackson Lee	McDermott	Serrano
Green, Al	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	Price, Tom	Schrader	Walker	Jeffries	McGovern	Sowell (AL)
Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray	T.	Ratcliffe	Schweikert	Walorski	Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Sherman
Grijalva	(NM)	Sarbanes	Reed	Scott, Austin	Walters, Mimi	Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Sinema
Guínta	Lynch	Schakowsky	Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)	Kaptur	Meng	Sires
Gutiérrez	Maloney,	Scott (VA)	Renacci	Sessions	Webster (FL)	Keating	Moore	Slaughter
Hahn	Carolyn	Scott, David	Ribble	Shimkus	Wenstrup	Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Hanna	Maloney, Sean	Serrano	Rice (SC)	Shuster	Westerman	Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Sewell (AL)	Rigell	Simpson	Westmoreland	Kildee	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins	McGovern	Sherman	Roby	Smith (MO)	Whitfield	Kilmer	Napolitano	Takano
Himes	McNerney	Sinema	Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Williams	Kind	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Hinojosa	Meeks	Sires	Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)	Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Honda	Meng	Slaughter	Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wittman	Kuster	Norcross	Titus
Hoyer	Moore	Smith (WA)	Rohrabacher	Stewart	Womack	Langevin	O'Rourke	Tonko
Huffman	Moulton	Speier	Rokita	Stivers	Woodall	Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Torres
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Stefanik	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Yoder	Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Tsongas
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Yoho	Lawrence	Payne	Van Hollen
Jeffries	Napolitano	Takano	Roskam	Tiberi	Young (AK)	Lee	Pelosi	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Thompson (CA)	Ross	Tipton	Young (IA)	Levin	Perlmutter	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Thompson (MS)	Rothfus	Trott	Young (IN)	Lewis	Pingree	
Katko	Norcross	Titus	Rouzer	Turner	Zeldin	Lieu, Ted	Pocan	
Keating	O'Rourke	Tonko	Royce	Upton	Zinke	Lipinski	Price (NC)	
Kelly (IL)	Pallone	Torres	Russell	Valadao		Loeb sack	Quigley	
Kennedy	Pascrell	Tsongas				Lofgren	Rangel	
Kildee	Payne	Van Hollen				Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	
Kilmer	Pelosi	Vargas	DeSaulnier	Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta	Ruiz	Ruppersberger	
Kind	Perlmutter	Veasey	Foxx	Marino	Stutzman	Lujan Grisham	Rush	
Kirkpatrick	Peterson	Vela	Hastings	Poe (TX)	Takai	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	
Kuster	Pingree	Velázquez				Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda	
Langevin	Pocan	Walz				(NM)	T.	
Larsen (WA)	Poliquin	Wasserman				Maloney,	Sarbanes	
Larson (CT)	Polis	Schultz				Carolyn	Schakowsky	
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine						
Lee	Quigley	Watson Coleman						
Levin	Rangel	Welch						
Lewis	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)						
Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Yarmuth						
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard							
Loeb sack								

NOES—241

Abraham	Duffy	Kelly (MS)
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Allen	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Amash	Ellmers (NC)	King (NY)
Amodei	Emmer (MN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Babin	Farenthold	Kline
Barletta	Fincher	Knight
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Barton	Fleischmann	LaHood
Bilirakis	Fleming	LaMalfa
Bishop (MI)	Flores	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Lance
Black	Fortenberry	Latta
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Blum	Frelinghuysen	Long
Bost	Garamendi	Loudermilk
Boustany	Garrett	Love
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Lucas
Brat	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	Lummis
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	MacArthur
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Marchant
Buchanan	Granger	Massie
Buck	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Byrne	Griffith	McCollum
Calvert	Grothman	McDermott
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	McHenry
Carter (TX)	Hardy	McKinley
Chabot	Harper	McMorris
Chaffetz	Harris	Rodgers
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	McSally
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Meadows
Cole	Hensarling	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Messer
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Mica
Comstock	Hill	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Holding	Miller (MI)
Cook	Hudson	Moolenaar
Cramer	Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Mullin
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Mulvaney
Culberson	Hunter	Murphy (PA)
Cummings	Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer
Curbelo (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Newhouse
Davidson	Issa	Noem
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Nugent
DeBene	Jenkins (WV)	Nunes
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Olson
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo
DesJarlais	Jones	Palmer
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Paulsen
Dold	Joyce	Pearce
Donovan	Kaptur	Perry

NOT VOTING—9

Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta
Marino	Stutzman
Poe (TX)	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2231

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—173

Adams	Castro (TX)	Doggett
Agullar	Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael
Ashford	Cicilline	F.
Bass	Clark (MA)	Duckworth
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Becerra	Clay	Ellison
Bera	Cleaver	Engel
Beyer	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Esty
Blumenauer	Connolly	Farr
Bonamici	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Fudge
F.	Crowley	Gabbard
Brady (PA)	Cueellar	Gallego
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Graham
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Capps	DeGette	Grijalva
Capuano	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Cardenas	DeLauro	Hahn
Carney	DeBene	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Cartwright	Deutch	Hinojosa
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Honda

Abraham	Ellmers (NC)	Kinzing (IL)
Aderholt	Emmer (MN)	Kline
Allen	Farenthold	Knight
Amash	Fincher	Labrador
Amodei	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Babin	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barletta	Fleming	Lamborn
Barr	Flores	Lance
Barton	Forbes	Latta
Benishak	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Foster	Long
Bishop (MI)	Franks (AZ)	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Frelinghuysen	Love
Black	Garamendi	Lucas
Blackburn	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Blum	Gibbs	Lummis
Bost	Gibson	MacArthur
Boustany	Gohmert	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Massie
Brat	Gosar	McCarthy
Bridenstine	Gowdy	McCaul
Brooks (AL)	Granger	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Buchanan	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Buck	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Bucshon	Griffith	Rodgers
Burgess	Grothman	McSally
Byrne	Guinta	Meadows
Calvert	Guthrie	Meehan
Carter (GA)	Hanna	Messer
Carter (TX)	Hardy	Mica
Chabot	Harper	Miller (FL)
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller (MI)
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)
Cole	Hensarling	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)
Comstock	Hill	Neugebauer
Conaway	Himes	Newhouse
Cook	Holding	Noem
Cooper	Hudson	Nugent
Costa	Huelskamp	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Cramer	Hultgren	Palazzo
Crawford	Hunter	Palmer
Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)	Paulsen
Culberson	Hurt (VA)	Pearce
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Peters
DeBene	Jenkins (WV)	Peterson
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
DesJarlais	Jones	Poliquin
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Polis
Dold	Joyce	Pompeo
Donovan	Katko	Posey
	Kelly (MS)	Price, Tom
	Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe
	King (IA)	Reed
	King (NY)	Reichert

Renacci	Schweikert	Walberg	McNerney	Price (NC)	Speier	Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Webster (FL)
Ribble	Scott, Austin	Walden	Meehan	Quigley	Stefanik	Schweikert	Thornberry	Welch
Rice (NY)	Sensenbrenner	Walker	Meeks	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	Scott (VA)	Tiberi	Wenstrup
Rice (SC)	Sessions	Walorski	Meng	Richmond	Thompson (MS)	Scott, Austin	Tipton	Westerman
Rigell	Shimkus	Walters, Mimi	Moolenaar	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	Sensenbrenner	Titus	Westmoreland
Roby	Shuster	Weber (TX)	Moore	Ruppersberger	Torres	Sessions	Trott	Whitfield
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Webster (FL)	Moulton	Rush	Tsongas	Shimkus	Turner	Williams
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Wenstrup	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Upton	Shuster	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westerman	Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen	Simpson	Vela	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland	Napolitano	Sarbanes	Vargas	Sinema	Visclosky	Womack
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Whitfield	Neal	Schakowsky	Veasey	Smith (MO)	Wagner	Woodall
Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Williams	Norcross	Schiff	Velázquez	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Yoder
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Wilson (SC)	O'Rourke	Scott, David	Wasserman	Smith (TX)	Walden	Yoho
Roskam	Stivers	Wittman	Pallone	Serrano	Schultz	Smith (WA)	Walker	Young (AK)
Ross	Thompson (PA)	Womack	Pascarell	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine	Stewart	Walorski	Young (IA)
Rothfus	Thornberry	Woodall	Payne	Sherman	Watson Coleman	Stivers	Walters, Mimi	Young (IN)
Rouzer	Tiberi	Yoder	Pelosi	Sires	Wilson (FL)	Takano	Walz	Zeldin
Royce	Tipton	Yoho	Pingree	Slaughter	Yarmuth	Thompson (CA)	Weber (TX)	Zinke
Russell	Trott	Young (AK)	Pocan	Smith (NJ)				
Salmon	Turner	Young (IA)	Poliquin					
Sanford	Upton	Young (IN)						
Scalise	Valadao	Zeldin						
Schrader	Wagner	Zinke						

NOT VOTING—9

Foxx	Marino	Sanchez, Loretta
Hastings	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Jolly	Richmond	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2236

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 282, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—143

Barletta	Cuellar	Himes
Bass	Cummings	Hinojosa
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Israel
Becerra	Delaney	Jackson Lee
Bera	DeLauro	Jeffries
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
F.	Dingell	Katko
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Keating
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Bustos	F.	Kind
Capuano	Duckworth	Kuster
Cárdenas	Edwards	Lance
Carney	Ellison	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Eshoo	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Esty	Lee
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Levin
Chu, Judy	Foster	Lewis
Ciциlline	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Clark (MA)	Fudge	LoBiondo
Clarke (NY)	Garrett	Loebach
Clay	Gibson	Lofgren
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowey
Cohen	Green, Al	Lynch
Conyers	Green, Gene	MacArthur
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Maloney
Courtney	Hahn	Carolyn
Crowley	Higgins	McGovern

NOES—282

Abraham	Fleischmann	Lucas
Adams	Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Aderholt	Flores	Lujan Grisham
Aguilar	Forbes	(NM)
Allen	Fortenberry	Luján, Ben Ray
Amash	Franks (AZ)	(NM)
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Ashford	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Babin	Gallo	Marchant
Barr	Garamendi	Massie
Barton	Gibbs	Matsui
Benishek	Gohmert	McCarthy
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McCaul
Bishop (GA)	Gosar	McClintock
Bishop (MI)	Gowdy	McCollum
Bishop (UT)	Graham	McDermott
Black	Granger	McHenry
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Blum	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Blumenauer	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Bonamici	Griffith	McSally
Bost	Grijalva	Meadows
Boustany	Grothman	Messer
Brady (TX)	Guinta	Mica
Brat	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Bridenstine	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Hardy	Mooney (WV)
Brownley (CA)	Harper	Mullin
Buchanan	Harris	Mulvaney
Buck	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Neugebauer
Burgess	Heck (WA)	Newhouse
Butterfield	Hensarling	Noem
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Nolan
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Nugent
Capps	Hill	Nunes
Carter (GA)	Holding	Olson
Carter (TX)	Honda	Palazzo
Chabot	Hoyer	Palmer
Chaffetz	Hudson	Paulsen
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Pearce
Cleaver	Huffman	Perlmutter
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Perry
Cole	Hultgren	Peters
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Peterson
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Pittenger
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Pitts
Conaway	Issa	Polis
Connolly	Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Posey
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe
Cramer	Jones	Reed
Crawford	Jordan	Reichert
Crenshaw	Joyce	Renacci
Culberson	Kaptur	Ribble
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Rice (NY)
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Rigell
Davis, Rodney	Kilmer	Roby
DeFazio	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
DeGette	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
DeBene	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Kirkpatrick	Rohrabacher
Dent	Kline	Rokita
DeSantis	Knight	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Roskam
Dold	LaMalfa	Ross
Duffy	Lamborn	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Royce
Ellmers (NC)	Lipinski	Ruiz
Emmer (MN)	Long	Russell
Farmenhold	Loudermilk	Salmon
Farr	Love	Sanford
Fincher	Lowenthal	Scalise

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx	Marino	Stutzman
Hastings	Poe (TX)	Takai
Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2239

Mr. GARRETT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—190

Adams	Cohen	Fudge
Aguilar	Connolly	Gabbard
Ashford	Conyers	Gallo
Bass	Cooper	Garamendi
Beatty	Courtney	Gibson
Becerra	Crowley	Graham
Bera	Cummings	Grayson
Beyer	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
F.	DeGette	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Herrera Beutler
Brownley (CA)	DeBene	Higgins
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Himes
Butterfield	Deutch	Hinojosa
Capps	Dingell	Honda
Capuano	Doggett	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Dold	Huffman
Carney	Doyle, Michael	Israel
Carson (IN)	F.	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Duckworth	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Chu, Judy	Engel	Kaptur
Ciциlline	Eshoo	Keating
Clark (MA)	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Kennedy
Clay	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Clyburn	Foster	Kilmer
	Frankel (FL)	Kind

Kirkpatrick Nadler Scott (VA)
Kuster Napolitano Scott, David
Langevin Neal Serrano
Larsen (WA) Nolan Sewell (AL)
Larson (CT) Norcross Sherman
Lawrence O'Rourke Sinema
Lee Pallone Sires
Levin Pascrell
Lewis Payne
Lieu, Ted Pelosi
Lipinski Perlmutter
LoBiondo Peters
Loeb sack Pingree
Loifgren Pocan
Lowenthal Poliquin
Lowe y Polis
Lujan Grisham Price (NC)
(NM) Quigley
Luján, Ben Ray Rangel
(NM) Reichert
Lynch Rice (NY)
Maloney, Carolyn Richmond
Maloney, Sean Ros-Lehtinen
Matsui Roybal-Allard
McCollum Ruiz
McDermott Ruppertsberger
McGovern Rush
McNerney Ryan (OH)
Meeks Sánchez, Linda
Meng T.
Moore Sarbanes
Moulton Schakowsky
Murphy (FL) Schiff
Schrader

NOES—235

Abraham Fincher
Aderholt Fleischmann
Allen Fleming
Amash Flores
Amodei Forbes
Babin Fortenberry
Barletta Franks (AZ)
Barr Frelinghuysen
Barton Garrett
Benishek Gibbs
Bilirakis Gohmert
Bishop (GA) Goodlatte
Bishop (MI) Gosar
Bishop (UT) Gowdy
Black Granger
Blackburn Graves (GA)
Blum Graves (LA)
Bost Graves (MO)
Boustany Griffith
Brady (TX) Grothman
Brat Guinta
Bridenstine Guthrie
Brooks (AL) Hanna
Brooks (IN) Hardy
Buchanan Harper
Buck Harris
Bucshon Hartzler
Burgess Heck (NV)
Byrne Hensarling
Calvert Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA) Hill
Carter (TX) Holding
Chabot Hudson
Chaffetz Huelskamp
Clawson (FL) Huizenga (MI)
Coffman Hultgren
Cole Hunter
Collins (GA) Hurd (TX)
Collins (NY) Hurt (VA)
Comstock Issa
Conaway Jenkins (KS)
Cook Jenkins (WV)
Costa Johnson (OH)
Costello (PA) Johnson, Sam
Cramer Jones
Crawford Jordan
Crenshaw Joyce
Cuellar Katko
Culberson Kelly (MS)
Davidson Kelly (PA)
Davis, Rodney King (IA)
Denham King (NY)
Dent Kinzinger (IL)
DeSantis Kline
DesJarlais Knight
Diaz-Balart Labrador
Donovan LaHood
Duffy LaMalfa
Duncan (SC) Lamborn
Duncan (TN) Lance
Ellmers (NC) Latta
Emmer (MN) Long
Farenthold Loudermilk

Sanford Scalise
Schweikert Tiberi
Scott, Austin Tipton
Sensenbrenner Trott
Sessions Turner
Shimkus Upton
Shuster Valadao
Simpson Wagner
Smith (MO) Walberg
Smith (NE) Walden
Smith (TX) Walker
Stefanik Walorski
Stewart Walters, Mimi
Stivers Weber (TX)
Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)
Wenstrup Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino
Hastings Poe (TX)
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2242

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
HUFFMAN) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 184, noes 240,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—184

Adams Courtney
Aguilar Crowley
Bass Cummings
Beatty Curbelo (FL)
Becerra Davis (CA)
Bera Davis, Danny
Beyer DeFazio
Blumenauer DeGette
Bonamici Delaney
Boyle, Brendan DeLauro
F. DelBene
Brady (PA) DeSaulnier
Brown (FL) Deutch
Brownley (CA) Dingell
Bustos Doggett
Butterfield Dold
Capps Doyle, Michael
Capuano F.
Cárdenas Duckworth
Carney Edwards
Carson (IN) Ellison
Cartwright Engel
Castor (FL) Eshoo
Castro (TX) Esty
Chu, Judy Farr
Cicilline Foster
Clark (MA) Frankel (FL)
Clarke (NY) Fudge
Clawson (FL) Gabbard
Clay Gallego
Cleaver Garamendi
Clyburn Gibson
Cohen Graham
Connolly Grayson
Conyers Grijalva
Cooper Gutiérrez
Costa Hahn

Westerman Luján, Ben Ray
Westmoreland (NM)
Whitfield Lynch
Williams Maloney,
Wilson (SC) Carolyn
Wittman Maloney, Sean
Womack Matsui
Woodall McCollum
Yoder McDermott
Yoho McGovern
Young (AK) McNerney
Young (IA) Meeks
Young (IN) Meng
Zeldin Moore
Zinke Moulton
Murphy (FL) Rush
Nadler Ryan (OH)
Napolitano Sánchez, Linda
T.
Neal Sarbanes
Nolan Schakowsky
Norcross Schiff
O'Rourke Schrader
Pallone Scott (VA)
Pascrell Scott, David
Payne Sewell (AL)
Pelosi Sherman
Perlmutter Sinema

NOES—240

Abraham Frelinghuysen
Aderholt Garrett
Allen Gibbs
Amash Gohmert
Amodei Goodlatte
Ashford Gosar
Babin Gowdy
Barletta Granger
Barr Graves (GA)
Barton Graves (LA)
Benishek Graves (MO)
Bilirakis Green, Al
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
Bishop (MI) Griffith
Bishop (UT) Grothman
Black Guinta
Blackburn Guthrie
Blum Hardy
Bost Harper
Boustany Harris
Brady (TX) Hartzler
Brat Heck (NV)
Bridenstine Hensarling
Brooks (AL) Herrera Beutler
Brooks (IN) Hice, Jody B.
Buchanan Hill
Buck Holding
Bucshon Hudson
Burgess Huelskamp
Byrne Huizenga (MI)
Calvert Hultgren
Carter (GA) Hunter
Carter (TX) Hurd (TX)
Chabot Hurt (VA)
Chaffetz Issa
Coffman Jackson Lee
Cole Jenkins (KS)
Collins (GA) Jenkins (WV)
Collins (NY) Johnson (OH)
Comstock Johnson, Sam
Conaway Jordan
Cook Joyce
Costello (PA) Katko
Cramer Kelly (MS)
Crawford Kelly (PA)
Crenshaw King (IA)
Cuellar King (NY)
Culberson Kinzinger (IL)
Davidson Kline
Davis, Rodney Knight
Denham Labrador
Dent LaHood
DeSantis LaMalfa
DesJarlais Lamborn
Diaz-Balart Lance
Donovan Latta
Duffy LaHood
Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
Duncan (TN) Lamborn
Ellmers (NC) Lance
Emmer (MN) Latta
Farenthold Long
Fortenberry Loudermilk
Franks (AZ) McNerney

McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Jenkins (WV)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry Walorski Womack
Tiberi Walters, Mimi Woodall
Tipton Weber (TX) Yoder
Trott Webster (FL) Yoho
Turner Wenstrup Young (AK)
Upton Westerman Young (IA)
Valadao Westmoreland Young (IN)
Wagner Whitfield Zeldin
Walberg Williams Zinke
Walden Wilson (SC)
Walker Wittman

NOT VOTING—9

Foxx Marino Serrano
Hastings Poe (TX) Stutzman
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2245

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—186

Adams Cummings Hoyer
Aguilar Curbelo (FL) Huffman
Bass Davis (CA) Israel
Beatty Davis, Danny Jeffries
Becerra DeFazio Johnson (GA)
Bera DeGette Johnson, E. B.
Beyer Delaney Kaptur
Bishop (GA) DeLauro Keating
Blumenauer DelBene Kelly (IL)
Bonamici DeSaulnier Kennedy
Boyle, Brendan Deutch Kildee
F. Dingell Kilmer
Brady (PA) Doggett Kind
Brown (FL) Dold Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA) Doyle, Michael Kuster
Buchanan F. Langevin
Bustos Duckworth Larsen (WA)
Butterfield Edwards Larson (CT)
Capps Ellison Lawrence
Capuano Engel Lee
Cárdenas Eshoo Levin
Carney Esty Lewis
Carson (IN) Farr Lieu, Ted
Cartwright Foster Lipinski
Castor (FL) Frankel (FL) LoBiondo
Castro (TX) Fudge Loeb sack
Chu, Judy Gabbard Lofgren
Cicilline Gallego Lowenthal
Clark (MA) Garamendi Lowey
Clarke (NY) Graham Lujan Grisham
Clawson (FL) Grayson (NM)
Clay Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray
Cleaver Gutiérrez (NM)
Clyburn Hahn Lynch
Cohen Hanna Maloney,
Connolly Heck (WA) Carolyn
Conyers Higgins Maloney, Sean
Cooper Himes Matsui
Courtney Hinojosa McCollum
Crowley Honda McDermott

McGovern McGovern
McNerney McNerney
Meeks Meeks
Meng Meng
Moore Moore
Moulton Moulton
Murphy (FL) Murphy (FL)
Nadler Nadler
Napolitano Napolitano
Neal Nolan
Norcross Norcross
Nugent Nugent
O'Rourke O'Rourke
Pallone Pallone
Pascrell Pascrell
Payne Payne
Pelosi Pelosi
Perlmutter Perlmutter
Peters Peters
Pingree Pingree
Pocan Pocan
Poliquin Poliquin
Polis Polis
Price (NC) Price (NC)

Abraham Gibson
Aderholt Gohmert
Allen Goodlatte
Amash Gosar
Amodei Gowdy
Ashford Granger
Babin Graves (GA)
Barletta Graves (LA)
Barr Graves (MO)
Barton Green, Al
Benishek Green, Gene
Billirakis Griffith
Bishop (MI) Grothman
Bishop (UT) Guinta
Black Guthrie
Blackburn Hardy
Blum Harper
Blum Harris
Bost Hartzler
Boustany Heck (NV)
Brady (TX) Hensarling
Brat Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL) Hill
Brooks (IN) Holding
Buck Hudson
Bucshon Huelskamp
Burgess Huizenga (MI)
Byrne Hultgren
Calvert Hunter
Carter (GA) Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX) Hurt (VA)
Chabot Issa
Chaffetz Jackson Lee
Coffman Jenkins (KS)
Cole Collins (GA)
Collins (NY) Collins (NY)
Comstock Johnson (OH)
Conaway Johnson, Sam
Cook Jones
Costa Jordan
Costello (PA) Katko
Cramer Kelly (MS)
Crawford Kelly (PA)
Crenshaw King (IA)
Cuellar King (NY)
Culberson Kingzinger (IL)
Davidson Kline
Davis, Rodney Knight
Denham Labrador
Dent LaHood
DeSantis LaMalfa
DesJarlais Lamborn
Diaz-Balart Lance
Donovan Latta
Duffy Long
Duncan (SC) Loudermilk
Duncan (TN) Love
Elmiers (NC) Lucas
Emmer (MN) Luetkemeyer
Farenthold Lummis
Fincher MacArthur
Fitzpatrick Marchant
Fleischmann Massie
Fleming McCarthy
Flores McCaul
Flores McClintock
Forbes McHenry
Fortenberry McKinley
Franks (AZ) McMorris
Frelinghuysen Rodgers
Garrett McSally
Gibbs Meadows

NOES—237

Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Speier Speier
Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
Takano Takano
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Titus Titus
Tonko Tonko
Torres Torres
Tsongas Tsongas
Van Hollen Van Hollen
Vargas Vargas
Veasey Veasey
Velázquez Velázquez
Visclosky Visclosky
Walz Walz
Wasserman Wasserman
Schultz Schultz
Waters, Maxine Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
Welch Welch
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth Yarmuth

Walden Walden
Walker Walker
Walorski Walorski
Walters, Mimi Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
Wenstrup Wenstrup
Westerman Westerman

NOT VOTING—10

Foxx Marino Takai
Hastings Poe (TX) Tiberi
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta
Joyce Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2249

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—181

Adams DeLauro Kildee
Aguilar DelBene Kilmer
Bass DeSaulnier Kind
Beatty Deutch Kirkpatrick
Becerra Dingell Kuster
Bera Doggett Langevin
Beyer Dold Larsen (CA)
Blumenauer Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)
Bonamici F. Lawrence
Boyle, Brendan Duckworth Lee
F. Edwards Levin
Brady (PA) Ellison Lewis
Brown (FL) Engel Lieu, Ted
Brownley (CA) Eshoo Lipinski
Bustos Esty Loeb sack
Butterfield Farr Lofgren
Capps Foster Lowenthal
Capuano Frankel (FL) Lowey
Cárdenas Fudge Lujan Grisham
Carney Gabbard (NM)
Carson (IN) Gallego Luján, Ben Ray
Cartwright Garamendi (NM)
Castor (FL) Graham Lynch
Castro (TX) Grayson Maloney,
Chu, Judy Green, Al Carolyn
Cicilline Grijalva Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA) Gutiérrez Matsui
Clarke (NY) Hahn McCollum
Clawson (FL) Heck (WA) McDermott
Clay Higgins McGovern
Cleaver Himes McNerney
Clyburn Hinojosa Meeks
Cohen Hinojosa Meng
Connolly Honda Moore
Conyers Hoyer Moulton
Cooper Huffman Murphy (FL)
Courtney Israel Nadler
Crowley Jackson Lee Napolitano
Cummings Jeffries Neal
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA)
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B.
Davis, Danny Kaptur Norcross
DeFazio Keating O'Rourke
DeGette Kelly (IL) Pallone
Delaney Kennedy Pascrell

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Foxy
Hastings
Jolly

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Marino
Poe (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta

Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce

Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting Chair (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2252

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

AYES—208

ABRAHAM
ADERHOLT
ALLEN
AMASH
AMODEI
ASHFORD
BABIN
BARLETTA
BARR
BARTON
BENISHEK
BILIRAKIS
BISHOP (GA)
BISHOP (MI)
BISHOP (UT)
BLACK
BLACKBURN
BLUM
BOST
BOUSTANY
BRADY (TX)
BRAT
BRIDENSTINE
BROOKS (AL)
BROOKS (IN)
BUCHANAN
BUCK
BUCSHON
BURGESS
BYRNE
CALVERT
CARTER (GA)
CARTER (TX)
CHABOT
CHAFFETZ
CLAWSON (FL)
COFFMAN
COLE
COLLINS (GA)
COLLINS (NY)
COMSTOCK
CONAWAY
COOK
COSTA
COSTELLO (PA)
CRAMER
CRAWFORD
CRENSHAW
CUELLAR
CULBERSON
DAVIDSON
DAVIS, RODNEY
DENHAM
DENT
DESANTIS
DESJARLAIS
DIAZ-BALART
DONOVAN
DUFFY
DUNCAN (SC)
DUNCAN (TN)
ELLMERS (NC)
EMMER (MN)
FARENTHOLD
FINCHER
FITZPATRICK
FLEISCHMANN
FLEMING
FLORES
FORBES
FORTENBERRY
FRANKS (AZ)
FRELINGHUYSEN
GARRETT
GIBBS
GIBSON
GOHMERT
GOODLATTE

GOSAR
GOWDY
GRANGER
GRAVES (GA)
GRAVES (LA)
GRAVES (MO)
GREEN, GENE
GRIFFITH
GROTHMAN
GUINTA
GUTHRIE
HANNA
HARDY
HARPER
HARRIS
HARTZLER
HECK (NV)
HENSARLING
HERRERA BEUTLER
HICE, JODY B.
HILL
HOLDING
HUDSON
HUELSKAMP
HUIZENGA (MI)
HULTGREN
HUNTER
HURD (TX)
HURT (VA)
ISSA
JENKINS (KS)
JENKINS (WV)
JOHNSON (OH)
JOHNSON, SAM
JONES
JORDAN
JOYCE
KATKO
KELLY (MS)
KELLY (PA)
KING (IA)
KING (NY)
KINZINGER (IL)
KLINE
KNIGHT
LABRADOR
LAHOOD
LAMALFA
LAMBORN
LANCE
LATT
LUMMIS
LOBIONDO
LONG
LODERMILK
LOVE
LUCAS
LUETKEMEYER
LUMMIS
MACARTHUR
MARCHANT
MASSIE
MC CARTHY
MCCAUL
MCCLEINTOCK
MC HENRY
MCKINLEY
MCMORRIS
RODGERS
MCSALLY
MEADOWS
MEEHAN
MESSER
MICA
MILLER (FL)
MILLER (MI)
MOOLENAAR
MOONEY (WV)
MULLIN

ABRAHAM
ADERHOLT
ALLEN
AMASH
AMODEI
BABIN
BARLETTA
BARR
BARTON
BENISHEK
BILIRAKIS
BISHOP (MI)
BISHOP (UT)
BLACK
BLACKBURN
BLUM
BOST
BOUSTANY
BRADY (TX)
BRAT
BRIDENSTINE
BROOKS (AL)
BROOKS (IN)
BUCHANAN
BUCK
BUCSHON
BURGESS
BYRNE
CARTER (GA)
CARTER (TX)
CHABOT
CHAFFETZ
CLAWSON (FL)
COFFMAN
COLE
COLLINS (GA)
COLLINS (NY)
COMSTOCK
CONAWAY
CRAWFORD
CRENSHAW
CUELLAR
CULBERSON
DAVIDSON
DAVIS, RODNEY
DENHAM
DENT
DESANTIS
DESJARLAIS
DIAZ-BALART
DONOVAN
DUFFY
DUNCAN (SC)
DUNCAN (TN)
ELLMERS (NC)
EMMER (MN)
FARENTHOLD
FINCHER
FITZPATRICK
FLEISCHMANN
FLEMING
FLORES
FORBES
FORTENBERRY
FRANKS (AZ)
FRELINGHUYSEN
GARRETT
GIBBS
GIBSON
GOHMERT
GOODLATTE

ADAMS
AGUIAR
ASHFORD
BASS
BEATTY
BECERRA
BERA
BEYER
BISHOP (GA)
BLUMENAUER
BONAMICI
BOYLE, BRENDAN
F.
BRADY (PA)
BROWN (FL)
BROWNLEY (CA)
BUSTOS
BUTTERFIELD
CALVERT
CAPPS
CAPUANO
CÁRDENAS
CARNEY
CARSON (IN)
CARTWRIGHT
CASTOR (FL)
CASTRO (TX)
CHU, JUDY
CICILLINE
CLARK (MA)
CLARKE (NY)
CLAY
CLEAVER
CLYBURN
COHEN
CONNOLLY
CONYERS
COOK
COOPER
COSTA
COSTELLO (PA)
COURTNEY
CROWLEY
CUELLAR
CUMMINGS
CURBELO (FL)
DAVIS (CA)
DAVIS, DANNY
DEFazio
DEGETTE
DELANEY
DELAURO
DEBENE
DENT
DESJARDINIER
DEUTCH
DIAZ-BALART
DINGELL
DOGGETT
DOLD
DONOVAN
DOYLE, MICHAEL
F.
DUCKWORTH
EDWARDS
ELLISON
ENGEL
ESHOO
ESTY
FARR
FITZPATRICK
FORTENBERRY
FOSTER

NOES—217

FRANKEL (FL)
FRELINGHUYSEN
FUDGE
GABBARD
GALLEGO
GARAMENDI
GIBSON
GRAHAM
GRAYSON
GREEN, AL
GREEN, GENE
GRIJALVA
GUTIÉRREZ
HAHN
HANNA
HECK (NV)
HECK (WA)
HIGGINS
HIMES
HINOJOSA
HONDA
HOYER
HUFFMAN
ISRAEL
JACKSON LEE
JEFFRIES
JOHNSON (GA)
JOHNSON, E. B.
JOYCE
KAPTUR
KATKO
KEATING
KELLY (IL)
KENNEDY
KILDEE
KILMER
KIND
KING (NY)
KIRKPATRICK
KUSTER
LAMALFA
LANCE
LANGEVIN
LARSEN (WA)
LARSON (CT)
LAWRENCE
LEE
LEVIN
LEWIS
LIEU, TED
LIPINSKI
LOBIONDO
LOEBACK
LOFGREN
LOWENTHAL
LOWEY
LUJAN GRISHAM
(NM)
LUJÁN, BEN RAY
(NM)
LYNCH
MACARTHUR
MALONEY,
CAROLYN
MALONEY, SEAN
MATSUI
MCCOLLUM
MCDERMOTT
MCGOVERN
MCNERNEY
MCSALLY
MECKS
MENG

MILLER (MI)
MOONEY (WV)
MOORE
MOULTON
MURPHY (FL)
NADLER
NAPOLITANO
NEAL
NOLAN
NORCROSS
O'ROURKE
PALLONE
PASCRELL
PAULSEN
PAYNE
PELOSI
PERLMUTTER
PETERS
PETERSON
PINGREE
POCAN
POLIQUIN
POLIS
PRICE (NC)
QUIGLEY
RANGEL
REICHERT
RICE (NY)
RICHMOND
ROS-LEHTINEN
ROYBAL-ALLARD
RUZ
RUPPERSBERGER
RUSH
RYAN (OH)
SÁNCHEZ, LINDA
T.
SARBANES
SCHAKOWSKY
SCHIFF
SCHRADER
SCOTT (VA)
SCOTT, DAVID
SERRANO
SHERMAN
SIMPSON
SINEMA
SIREN
SLAUGHTER
SMITH (NJ)
SMITH (WA)
SPEIER
STEFANIK
LOWEY
SWALWELL (CA)
TAKANO
THOMPSON (CA)
THOMPSON (MS)
TITUS
TONKO
TORRES
TSONGAS
VAN HOLLEN
VARGAS
VEASEY
VELA
VELÁZQUEZ
VISCLOSKEY
WALTERS, MIMI
WALZ

Wasserman Watson Coleman Yarmuth
Schultz Welch
Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman
Hastings Poe (TX) Takai
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2255

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 175, noes 250,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—175

Abraham	Goodlatte	McMorris
Aderholt	Gosar	Rodgers
Allen	Gowdy	Meadows
Amash	Graves (GA)	Messer
Babin	Graves (MO)	Mica
Barr	Griffith	Miller (FL)
Barton	Grothman	Moolenaar
Benishek	Guinta	Mooney (WV)
Billrakis	Guthrie	Mullin
Bishop (MI)	Hardy	Mulvaney
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Neugebauer
Black	Harris	Newhouse
Blackburn	Hartzler	Olson
Blum	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Boustany	Hensarling	Palmer
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen
Brat	Hill	Pearce
Bridenstine	Holding	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Pittenger
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Pitts
Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Poliquin
Burgess	Hultgren	Pompeo
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Posey
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Price, Tom
Chaffetz	Hurt (VA)	Ratcliffe
Clawson (FL)	Issa	Ribble
Coffman	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rigell
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Jones	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Jordan	Rokita
Culberson	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Ross
DeSantis	Knight	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rouzer
Duffy	LaHood	Royce
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Russell
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Salmon
Emmer (MN)	Long	Sanford
Farenthold	Loudermilk	Scalise
Fincher	Love	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schott, Austin
Fleming	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Marchant	Sessions
Forbes	Massie	Shuster
Franks (AZ)	McCauley	Sinema
Garrett	McClintock	Smith (MO)
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (TX)

Stewart
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

NOES—250

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Aguilar	Frelinghuysen	Napolitano
Amodei	Fudge	Neal
Ashford	Gabbard	Noem
Barletta	Gallego	Nolan
Bass	Garamendi	Norcross
Beatty	Gibbs	Nugent
Becerra	Graham	Nunes
Bera	Granger	O'Rourke
Beyer	Graves (LA)	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Payne
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Bost	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gutiérrez	Peters
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Peterson
Brooks (IN)	Hanna	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Bucshon	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bustos	Himes	Quigley
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Rangel
Byrne	Honda	Reed
Calvert	Hoyer	Reichert
Capps	Huffman	Renacci
Capuano	Israel	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Roby
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Katko	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	King (IA)	Schrader
Cole	King (NY)	Scott (VA)
Collins (NY)	Kinzingler (IL)	Scott, David
Comstock	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Connolly	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	LaMalfa	Sherman
Cook	Lance	Shimkus
Cooper	Langevin	Simpson
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Costello (PA)	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Courtney	Lawrence	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Lee	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Levin	Speier
Cuellar	Lewis	Stefanik
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	LoBiondo	Takano
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thornberry
Delaney	Lowey	Titus
DeLauro	Lucas	Upton
DelBene	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Valadao
Denham	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Van Hollen
Dent	Lynch	Vargas
DeSaulnier	MacArthur	Veasey
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Carolyn	Velázquez
Dingell	McCarthy	Visclosky
Doggett	McCollum	Walorski
Dold	McDermott	Walz
Donovan	McGovern	Wasserman Schultz
Doyle, Michael F.	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Duckworth	McSally	Watson Coleman
Edwards	Meehan	Welch
Ellison	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Ellmers (NC)	Meng	Yarmuth
Engel	Miller (MI)	Young (AK)
Eshoo	Moore	Young (IN)
Esty	Moulton	
Farr	Murphy (FL)	
Fitzpatrick	Murphy (PA)	
Fortenberry		
Foster		

Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman
Hastings Poe (TX) Takai
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2258

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote
No. 426 on H.R. 5538, I mistakenly recorded
my vote as "yes" when I should have voted
"no."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN
RAY LUJÁN) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 219, noes 207,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—219

Adams	Crowley	Higgins
Aguilar	Cuellar	Hill
Amash	Cummings	Himes
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bass	Davis, Danny	Honda
Beatty	DeFazio	Hoyer
Becerra	DeGette	Huffman
Benishek	Delaney	Israel
Bera	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Beyer	DelBene	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (UT)	DeSaulnier	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Deutch	Jones
Bonamici	Dingell	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doggett	Keating
Brady (PA)	Dold	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Donovan	Kennedy
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kildee
Buck	Duckworth	Kilmer
Burgess	Edwards	Kind
Bustos	Ellison	King (NY)
Butterfield	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Eshoo	Kuster
Capuano	Esty	Lamborn
Cárdenas	Farr	Langevin
Carney	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Foster	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Levin
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Lewis
Chun, Judy	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clark (MA)	Gohmert	Loeb sack
Clarke (NY)	Gosar	Lofgren
Clay	Graham	Love
Cleaver	Graves (LA)	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Grayson	Lowe
Cohen	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Connolly	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Conyers	Grijalva	Lummis
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lynch
Costa	Hahn	Maloney, Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)	
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	

Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—207

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings
Jolly
Marino

Poe (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta
Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2302

Mr. SIRES and Ms. MCSALLY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 256, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—170

Adams
Agular
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter

Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse

Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salm
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin
Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings Poe (TX) Takai
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta
Marino Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2305

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR.
CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
CARTWRIGHT) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 195, noes 231,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—195

Adams DeLauro Kilmer
Aguilar DelBene Kind
Ashford DeSaulnier Kirkpatrick
Bass Deutch Kuster
Beatty Dingell Langevin
Becerra Doggett Larsen (WA)
Bera Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)
Beyer F. Lawrence
Bishop (GA) Duckworth Lee
Blumenauer Edwards Levin
Bonamici Ellison Lewis
Boyle, Brendan Engel Lieu, Ted
F. Eshoo Lipinski
Brady (PA) Esty LoBiondo
Brown (FL) Farr Loeb sack
Brownley (CA) Fitzpatrick Lofgren
Bustos Foster Lowenthal
Butterfield Frankel (FL) Lowey
Capps Fudge Lujan Grisham
Capuano Gabbard (NM)
Cárdenas Gallego Luján, Ben Ray
Carney Garamendi (NM)
Carson (IN) Gibson Lynch
Cartwright Graham Maloney,
Castor (FL) Grayson Carolyn
Castro (TX) Green, Al Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy Green, Gene Matsui
Ciциlline Grijalva McCollum
Clark (MA) Gutiérrez McDermott
Clarke (NY) Hahn McGovern
Clay Heck (WA) McNeerney
Cleaver Higgins Meeks
Clyburn Himes Meng
Cohen Hinojosa Miller (MI)
Connolly Honda Moore
Conyers Hoyer Moulton
Cooper Huffman Murphy (FL)
Costa Israel Nadler
Costello (PA) Jackson Lee Napolitano
Courtney Jeffries Neal
Crowley Johnson (GA) Nolan
Cuellar Johnson, E. B. Norcross
Cummings Jones O'Rourke
Curbelo (FL) Kaptur Pallone
Davis (CA) Katko Pascarell
Davis, Danny Keating Payne
DeFazio Kelly (IL) Pelosi
DeGette Kennedy Perlmutter
Delaney Kildee Peters

Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Kuster
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

NOES—231

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings Poe (TX) Takai
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta
Marino Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2308

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 190, noes 236,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—190

Adams Doggett Lieu, Ted
Aguilar Doyle, Michael Lipinski
Ashford F. Loeb sack
Bass Duckworth Lofgren
Beatty Edwards Lowenthal
Becerra Ellison Lowey
Bera Engel Lujan Grisham
Beyer Eshoo (NM)
Bishop (GA) Esty Luján, Ben Ray
Blumenauer Farr (NM)
Bonamici Foster Lynch
Boyle, Brendan Frankel (FL)
F. Fudge
Brady (PA) Gabbard Carolyn
Brown (FL) Gallego Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA) Garamendi Maloney, Sean
Bustos Gibson Matsui
Capuano Graham McCollum
Cárdenas Grayson McDermott
Carney Green, Al McGovern
Carson (IN) Green, Gene McNeerney
Cartwright Grijalva Meeks
Castor (FL) Gutiérrez Meng
Castro (TX) Hahn Moore
Chu, Judy Hanna Moulton
Ciциlline Heck (WA) Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA) Higgins Nadler
Clarke (NY) Himes Napolitano
Clay Hinojosa Neal
Cleaver Honda Nolan
Clyburn Hoyer Norcross
Cohen Huffman O'Rourke
Connolly Israel Pallone
Conyers Jackson Lee Pascarell
Cooper Jeffries Payne
Costa Johnson (GA) Pelosi
Courtney Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
Costa Kaptur Peters
Crowley Keating Peterson
Cuellar Kelly (IL) Pingree
Curbelo (FL) Kennedy Pocan
Davis (CA) Kildee Polis
Davis, Danny Kilmer Price (NC)
DeFazio Kind Quigley
DeGette Kirkpatrick Rangel
Delaney Johnson, E. B. Kuster Rice (NY)
Jones Richmond
Kaptur Larsen (WA) Ros-Lehtinen
Katko Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
Keating Lawrence Ruiz
Kelly (IL) Lee Ruppersberger
Kennedy Levin Rush
Kildee Lewis Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speler
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2311

Mr. CURBELO of Florida changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 244, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—182

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Fox, Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

NOES—236

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings
Jolly
Marino

Poe (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta
Stutzman

Takai

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Hoyer
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings
Jolly
Marino

Poe (TX)
Sanchez, Loretta
Stutzman

Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2314

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 241, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—185

Adams	Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Ellison	(NM)
Ashford	Engel	Lynch
Bass	Eshoo	Maloney,
Beatty	Esty	Carolyn
Becerra	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Foster	Matsui
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Blumenauer	Fudge	McDermott
Bonamici	Gabbard	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan	Galleo	McNerney
F.	Garamendi	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Gibson	Meng
Brown (FL)	Graham	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	Moulton
Bustos	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Nadler
Capps	Grijalva	Napolitano
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Neal
Cárdenas	Hahn	Nolan
Carney	Hanna	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Higgins	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Himes	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Payne
Chu, Judy	Honda	Pelosi
Cicilline	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Peterson
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pocan
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kaptur	Quigley
Conyers	Keating	Rangel
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Costa	Kennedy	Richmond
Courtney	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Crowley	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kind	Ruiz
Curbelo (FL)	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rush
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Lawrence	T.
Delaney	Lee	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lewis	Schiff
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loebach	Scott, David
Doggett	Lofgren	Serrano
Dold	Lowenthal	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Sinema
F.	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Duckworth	(NM)	Slaughter

Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Abraham	Graves (MO)
Aderholt	Griffith
Allen	Grothman
Amash	Guinta
Amodei	Guthrie
Babin	Hardy
Barletta	Harper
Barr	Harris
Barton	Hartzler
Benishek	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Hensarling
Bishop (GA)	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT)	Hill
Black	Holding
Blackburn	Hudson
Blum	Huelskamp
Bost	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Hunter
Brat	Hurd (TX)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (AL)	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)
Buck	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Jones
Byrne	Jordan
Calvert	Joyce
Carter (GA)	Katko
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	King (IA)
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)
Cole	Kirkpatrick
Collins (GA)	Kline
Collins (NY)	Knight
Comstock	Labrador
Conaway	LaHood
Cook	LaMalfa
Costello (PA)	Lamborn
Cramer	Lance
Crawford	Latta
Crenshaw	LoBiondo
Cuellar	Long
Culberson	Loudermilk
Davidson	Love
Davis, Rodney	Lucas
Denham	Luetkemeyer
Dent	Lummis
DeSantis	MacArthur
DesJarlais	Marchant
Diaz-Balart	Massie
Donovan	McCarthy
Duffy	McCaul
Duncan (SC)	McClintock
Duncan (TN)	McHenry
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley
Emmer (MN)	McMorris
Farenthold	Rodgers
Fincher	McSally
Fitzpatrick	Meadows
Fleischmann	Meehan
Fleming	Messer
Flores	Mica
Forbes	Miller (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)
Fox	Moolenaar
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin
Garrett	Mulvaney
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)
Gohmert	Neugebauer
Goodlatte	Newhouse
Gosar	Noem
Gowdy	Nugent
Granger	Nunes
Graves (GA)	Olson
Graves (LA)	Palazzo

NOES—241

Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Poe (TX)	Takai
Sanchez, Loretta	
Stutzman	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2317

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-686) on the resolution (H. Res. 822) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5538.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2321

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole