

A number of organizations have endorsed this amendment, including the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Wildlife Management Institute, The Quality Deer Management Association, National Deer Alliance, National Wildlife Federation, and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

I appreciate the opportunity today to offer this amendment and request the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. I agree that chronic wasting is a serious problem. We have it in Minnesota. We have spent a lot of money already in Minnesota on research as they have in Wisconsin and probably other places.

Does this do anything about the problem of this getting out of farm deer, farms and so forth? Because they just found in southern Minnesota that this was spread by deer getting out of a farm deer situation. They went in there, and every deer that was in that farm had chronic wasting disease.

Does it do anything in terms of doing research to go in and make sure those herds are not contributing to the problem?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for that question. It is an important part of this discussion. Actually, first of all, it is important for people to understand that, let me just say upfront, chronic wasting disease is not transmitted to humans. There is no case of that. I know that wasn't your question, but I think that is important. It is not transmitted to humans.

I think it is important for those who might be listening to understand that. I don't want to create a fear factor here.

The research of the USDA so far shows there has never been a documented case of a farm deer transferring CWD to wild population.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time. That is not true.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. All farm deer must be CWD certified, meaning testing for over 5 years, to be eligible for interstate shipment and commerce, and there is a USDA Federal rule, all farm deer in the Federal herd certification program must test 100 percent of their death loss for CWD, and State and Federal fish and wildlife agencies test a low percentage of wild deer for CWD.

So the focus on this is the wild deer. If a farm deer is determined to be CWD positive, in almost all cases, the entire herd is put down, as you had mentioned in your experience, leaving the farmer without a source of income or business.

The goal of the amendment, however, I think would help in that situation because the goal of the amendment is to find a live test or a cure for CWD since scientists believe it is naturally occurring in the wild. If we had a vaccine, we could then increase the number of sportsmen and -women in the field to help with the Pittman-Robertson funds that go to conservation.

The total economic impact of the farmed cervid industry is \$7.9 billion a year in the U.S. and employs almost 57,000 people who contribute greatly to rural American, State, and certainly Federal economies as well.

The outcome of this would benefit both farm but also wild CWD instances and cases, and prevent them.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the gentleman saying that USDA says there has never been a case where it has been transmitted from a farm to wildlife?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PETERSON. That is not true because it has happened in Minnesota in two or three cases. So maybe they need to be researched. They are a little behind the times it seems to me.

In southeast Minnesota, we don't have it up where I am at, but in the southeast, this is prevalent. The same thing in Wisconsin. So everybody that takes a deer has to take it into the DNR and get it tested currently.

Once this thing gets into the wild, it is very hard to eradicate without wiping out the whole herd, which some places are going to do that.

So I am supportive of what you are trying to do. I just want to make sure that we are doing, within the USDA and the animal welfare, health thing, that they have got some resources there that can go in and make sure that these farms are not transferring this stuff out in the wild when a deer gets loose. That is apparently what happened in southeast Minnesota. That is my only concern. Maybe we can work together on the language and improve it. I will support your amendment.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the House do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, 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. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1930

#### RUSSIAN INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, tonight, as we have every other week for the last few months, I want to talk about the Mueller investigation and the kinds of results that are being developed by the FBI, by the Department of Justice, on a lot of very serious topics. The main topic is the Russians interfering with our elections, particularly the 2016 election.

That kind of interference goes to the heart of our Nation. It goes to the heart of our freedom. It goes to the heart of our independence. It goes to the heart of this country's sovereignty and to be able to make decisions without interference by nations other than the United States of America, other than us as citizens of the United States of America. I think we need to step back and think about this a little bit, because it is clear now.

Just today, the Senate Republican chair of the Intelligence Committee said there is no doubt that Russia undertook an unprecedented effort to interfere with our 2016 elections. He says he looks forward to completing the committee's inquiry and issuing findings and recommendations to Americans.

The vice chairman, Senator WARNER from Virginia, says:

After a thorough review, our staff concluded that the intelligence community's conclusions were accurate and on point. The Russian effort was extensive, sophisticated, and ordered by President Putin himself for the purpose of helping Donald Trump and hurting Hillary Clinton.

In order to protect our democracy from future threats, we must understand what happened in 2016.

So, a year ago, Special Counsel Robert Mueller was appointed to look into this affair and what exactly happened and to bring those to justice who broke our laws, who interfered with our sovereignty and our freedoms.

But all along the way, the White House has objected, has tried to describe it as a witch hunt, as a hoax, as nothing but a charade, when, in fact, in this 1-year period there have been five guilty pleas and 22 indictments.

We kind have got to go back to the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

A year ago, Democrats were asking the President to turn over his tax returns, which all Presidents have done and which candidates do. The President refused and continues to refuse to this day to turn over his tax returns.

So the question is: What is in there to hide? What is the big deal? What is he afraid of us seeing in those tax returns?

Today, it came out in the news that the financial disclosure statement shows a payment to Michael Cohen, his attorney, that he said he never made.

We have got to get to the bottom of these numbers, to the bottom of this Russian interference. Mr. Mueller and the FBI need to conclude their investigation without any interference, without any obstruction. For all of us as Americans, this applies to the very core of what a democracy is, and that is free, fair, and unimpeded elections.

So there are three key questions that we keep asking. We ask our friends on the Republican side, particularly Speaker RYAN and Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL: Let's move forward with investigations here in this Congress. Why not?

Let's find out what is really going on. Let's protect this investigation so that threats by the White House to fire Mr. Mueller, to fire Rod Rosenstein from the Department of Justice—they did fire individuals out of the FBI—let's let these detectives and these law enforcement officials finish their job. But the questions are: What are they hiding? What are they afraid that people will see? And why not let the detectives and the law enforcement officers finish their job?

Let's play this out and see exactly what the facts are so we all know what happened and how we can stop it from happening again to make sure we have free and fair elections.

I have been able to ask these questions and participate in these Special Order hours with several of my friends. One of those who has taken a keen interest in protecting this investigation and making sure that the facts do come to light has been my friend, JARED HUFFMAN from northern California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), for some of his thoughts as to where we are, because we have had many, many changes in terms of the lawyers who were representing either the White House or the President personally. They are gone. We have got new lawyers. Former District Attorney and Mayor Giuliani is now involved. Other people. The President's personal lawyer, Mr. COHEN, is now out and under investigation himself. There seems to be something happening pretty much every day. I would like to get my friend's thoughts about it.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado is right that the pace of revelations and controversies surrounding this Trump White House and their personal financial and

political involvement with Russia, their attempts to interfere with and obstruct justice relating to Mr. Mueller's investigation, the pace of all that is just dizzy. So, here we are, 1 year into the work of Special Counsel Mueller.

I am glad that Congressman PERLMUTTER began his remarks by reminding us of the context of this issue; the fact that what happened in the 2016 Presidential election was a big deal. It was unprecedented. A foreign adversary maliciously interfered in our election with a specific intent to help one candidate and to hurt another. They placed a bet on Donald Trump. They put their thumb on the scale in every way they could to help Donald Trump.

Maybe that is why all along he has been reluctant to acknowledge what obviously happened. He doesn't want to talk about it. He wants to write it all off as a witch hunt and a conspiracy theory. He probably feels a little defensive about that cloud of legitimacy involving Russian interference.

Based on what we know so far, there may be an even more sinister explanation for some of his behavior. It may be that he—or, at least a lot of people very close to him—were actively working with the Russians as part of this. That is what the Mueller investigation is looking into and that is what the American people have to find out. We have to know the full extent of exactly what happened, no matter where those facts may lead.

The truth is, at this 1-year mark in this historic investigation, this historic scandal, there is plenty of reason to worry about what President Trump might do by way of trying to block and stop and interfere with this investigation. It is not just us saying it. You can look at his own word.

He has said at various times in recent months: "At some point I will have no choice but to use the powers granted to the Presidency and get involved."

That is obviously a threat, whether that is using his pardon power or beginning to fire people in the Department of Justice, the FBI, or even the Special Counsel himself.

He has threatened to reveal conflicts of interest of the Special Counsel. Obviously, this is a favorite tactic of President Trump, trying to intimidate, trying to posture with folks who he perceives as adversaries.

He said on another occasion: "Mueller is most conflicted of all (except Rosenstein who signed FISA & Comey letter). No Collusion, so they go crazy."

These are the ravings of someone who is acting very defensively. And I would say as a former attorney—Congressman PERLMUTTER is a former attorney himself—it really speaks to a consciousness of guilt. We would argue that if we were in a court of law and we had evidence of statements such as this repeatedly calling this investigation a witch hunt.

On another occasion, he says: "As I have been saying all along, it is all a big hoax by Democrats based on payments and lies. There should never have been a Special Counsel appointed. Witch hunt."

On another occasion he said:

Why don't I just fire Mueller? Well, we'll see what happens.

Taken together, all of his various statements should be very troubling to anyone who cares about the independence of our law enforcement agencies and about the integrity of this critically important investigation.

I am glad to stand with the gentleman tonight and every night that we have had these Special Order hours to continue to make sure that our colleagues here in the House know that we are going to defend this investigation, that we are going to do everything we can to make sure that our law enforcement professionals and Special Counsel Mueller have the chance to fully find the evidence, wherever it may lead, to get the truth out to the American people. We deserve nothing less.

I am glad to see our colleague, JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut, joining the conversation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from northern California, and his points are really well taken. This investigation, rather than just sort of pushing some paper around, we have had other special counsel appointed from time to time and just in this—some of them take years. Whether it was the Contra affair, Watergate, or whatever, it takes years and years.

Here, really in 1 year, we have had 13 Russian either agencies or corporations and individuals indicted. We have had at least six or seven Americans indicted in this whole process.

Recently, I think within the last few days, or maybe it was even today, Paul Manafort, chairman of the Trump campaign, objected to the indictment that he found himself under. He went to court and said that Mueller had exceeded his authority by bringing the indictment. The judge said: No, that indictment stands.

There has been a lot of smoke. We know that there is some fire creating that smoke. We have got to find that. We have got to find precisely what happened.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), who has joined us and has got some thoughts about this that he will share.

Mr. COURTNEY. First of all, I want to thank Congressman PERLMUTTER and Congressman HUFFMAN who have been, again, diligent in terms of coming to the floor on a regular basis to push back against what is clearly a pretty coordinated, concerted effort to discredit the Mueller investigation. It is really pretty disturbing on many levels, fundamentally because it is an attack on institutions within our country which we all took an oath to uphold and defend.

The rule of law is, frankly, one of the fundamental pillars of this country in terms of being a free society. When you have folks who, again, are holding public office going beyond just disagreements of opinion regarding actions that all of us as public officials have to be held accountable for, but really to attack the institutions themselves, which is clearly the drumbeat of criticism of the Mueller investigation and where it is headed, is something that really we need to speak out and push back against.

Again, the 1-year anniversary is, I think, a very important moment to step back and reflect in terms of where this investigation started and where it is today.

Again, if you go back a year ago and look at the reaction that greeted this appointment from, again, Republican leaders, Newt Gingrich, Robert Mueller is a superb choice to be special counsel. His reputation is impeccable for honesty and integrity.

Speaker PAUL RYAN: "My priority has been to ensure thorough . . . investigations are allowed to follow the facts wherever they may lead. . . . The addition of Robert Mueller as special counsel is consistent with this goal, and I welcome his role at the Department of Justice."

□ 1945

Senator CORY GARDNER:

Robert Mueller had an incredible reputation.

Senator ORRIN HATCH:

I commend the Department of Justice for bringing an independent voice to help clarify this situation.

The list goes on and on. And again, why not? I mean, Robert Mueller is somebody who has a record of service to this country going back to when he was a marine in Vietnam. He led a rifle platoon, was wounded, received a Purple Heart as well as the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry and two Navy Commendation medals for his military service.

He went on, obviously, to become a distinguished legal practitioner. He was appointed by President Bush to be the head of the FBI and did such a great job that, after his 10-year term, the U.S. Senate extended his term 2 years by a vote of 100-0.

So when you are talking about somebody who has really earned a reputation for being, really, a pretty conservative prosecutor, both in terms of his time as a U.S. attorney and also in terms of his term as head of the FBI, we are dealing with someone who is beyond reproach, frankly.

And as was pointed out by Mr. PERLMUTTER, the decision came down at the Washington, D.C., district court by Federal Judge Amy Berman Jackson in a 37-page opinion which, again, pushed back very powerfully about the notion that somehow he has strayed from his mission that the Department of Justice gave him.

Again, her decision, just in case after case, points out that the indictment of

Manafort fell perfectly within the charge that he was given by Assistant U.S. Attorney Rosenstein, which, again, is to investigate other issues that "may arise from the investigation."

Again, in the case of Manafort, we are talking about somebody who was squarely within the intelligence community's conclusion that the election was basically under attack from Russians. Manafort's connections to Ukrainian interests, which clearly were sort of on the Russian side of Ukrainian politics, is just an obvious place for the special counsel to pursue.

Again, as you point out, the number of indictments, the number of convictions, clearly show that this is not a fishing expedition, it is not a witch hunt. It is a serious prosecution whose every-step-of-the-way actions have been ratified by the courts and also ratified by the appointing authority, Mr. Rosenstein.

It is time for all elected officials to step back and let this process proceed. Again, the forensics on this in terms of just the endorsements to Mr. Mueller's credibility and experience and knowledge in this area scream out for all of us to respect the rule of law and let this investigation proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this event on the 1-year milestone of the Mueller investigation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Connecticut has reminded me of something. And I think something that has really infuriated me is the President's attacks on the FBI, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, our chief and top law enforcement agency in this country.

Is it perfect? Absolutely not. But are they doing their job to the best of their ability to protect Americans, to protect America? Absolutely. And for the President to sort of just continue to chip away and to excoriate the FBI because it is undertaking an investigation that may implicate him in breaking laws of the United States of America, I think, is something that we haven't seen. This investigation needs to continue to do its work, to talk to witnesses, to determine what has occurred here.

The Senate Judiciary today, or within the last day or two, released thousands of pages of testimony and information. One of the places that it talked about was what happened at a meeting—I think it was at the Trump Tower—in June of 2016, so 5 months, 6 months before the election, between a Russian attorney. I think another Russian was there; Paul Manafort, the chairman of the campaign; Jared Kushner, son-in-law of the President; and Donald Trump, Jr., his son.

There is a lot of concern about what actually occurred in that particular meeting. There is a lot of material here that is very, very troubling.

I know my friend from California has thought about this. He has thoughts about Mr. Giuliani saying that Donald

Trump may take the Fifth Amendment, which I think came out of nowhere. But why would he want to take the Fifth Amendment?

Again, the question is: What is he hiding? What is he afraid of? Let's just let law enforcement complete its work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of thoughts. First of all, that infamous Trump Tower meeting in June of 2016 just stinks to high heaven; the gentleman is absolutely right. Anyone who looks objectively at what we know about that meeting, anyone who is not hosting a show on FOX News, at least, would feel that there is a big, big problem here and we have got to ask some hard questions.

Of course, Donald Trump, Jr., initially outright lied about it, said it was about adoption. And then we saw the full text of the email exchange, making it very clear that this was the front-end part of a quid pro quo between the Trump operation and the Russians, that this was the offer of assistance, of dirt, of a bombshell on the Clinton campaign. And of course that was greeted with enthusiasm by Trump, Jr., who hastily arranged the meeting, brought in the top brass, said he was very excited about it if it is what he thought it was.

And then, when it proved not to reveal that bombshell, he immediately expressed how disappointed he was, and some phone calls ensued. One of those phone calls was from a restricted number, and he claims he didn't remember exactly who that call was. Well, turns out his dad, our President now, has a restricted number.

And that is a knowable fact. If our colleagues on the House Intelligence Committee were serious about this investigation, they would find out who that phone call was to because it is one of the dots that could need to be connected around this very controversial Trump Tower meeting. But they are not interested at all. They didn't ask those questions. They didn't even require Trump, Jr., to answer the questions, and they have rushed to shut down their investigation.

So that brings me to the other point. We have all talked about the threats to the Mueller investigation from President Trump himself, but there is another threat from within these walls, from our colleagues on the House Intelligence Committee, who have taken this sacred trust of oversight that we have as Members of Congress and, unfortunately, compromised it to the level that they seem to simply be fronting for the President instead of doing a genuine investigation.

Unlike their colleagues in the Senate who at least acknowledge the obvious, that Russia was trying to help President Trump in its interference, their report doesn't even say that. And then they include a gratuitous statement that they find no evidence of collusion, despite everything we have been talking about, everything that is already in

the public record. We have got a real problem within these walls that also threatens the investigation.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about quid pro quo, and the thing that I am worried about, I serve on the Terrorism and Illicit Finance Subcommittee of the Committee on Financial Services, where we deal a lot with sanctions: sanctions against North Korea, sanctions against Iran, sanctions against China, sanctions against Russia. With Russia having gone into Ukraine, Russia having gone into Crimea, and then Russia having interfered with our elections, a lot of sanctions are out there, but this administration seems to be using kid gloves in applying them.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just hit on the “quo.” We talked about the “quid”: the solicitations from Russia. Through Papadopoulos, even earlier, in April, the spring of 2016, those solicitations were welcomed and embraced by the highest levels of the Trump campaign, possibly even Mr. Trump himself. We need to nail down that phone call and a few other details.

But now we are talking about the “quo” part: what would Russia get in return? And we know from undisputed evidence that Mike Flynn was working on sanctions relief even before they took office, during the transition, violating, apparently, the Logan Act as he was doing it. We know that this President and others in his administration have bent over backwards to try to cut Russia breaks on these sanctions.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly right to focus on that obvious piece, the “quo” part of this seeming quid pro quo. That is another reason why we have to let this investigation run its course: so that we can find out exactly what happened here.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I know my friend from Connecticut has some other thoughts, so I yield to him.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, real briefly, again, as I mentioned earlier and the two gentlemen have alluded to, we are talking about an effort to discredit the Mueller investigation that I think, really, as all Americans, we really should be concerned about the questions about whether or not our court system is truly fair, whether or not the FBI, the leading law enforcement agency of this country, is corrupt, which is, again, some of the language that has been sort of tossed around by the President's defenders. The harm that does in terms of really basic institutions in this country is something that I just think you can't treat as normal political discourse. We are talking about real long-lasting harm to the country.

Right now there are FBI counterterrorism agents who are hard at work, literally, as we are standing here on

this floor, keeping this country safe. They are involved in investigations of mass shootings. You see the FBI jackets when these events happen, and they were in Connecticut when Sandy Hook took place.

I would just say, from a personal standpoint, my parents both served in the FBI. My dad was a G-man back in the day, and my mother actually was a clerical worker there. That is how they met, actually. So I guess you could say I was born under the watchful eye of the FBI.

But the fact of the matter is that he was somebody who was very proud of his service. Again, it was during World War II. His job was actually tracking fifth columnists in the U.S. who were looking to cause sabotage to critical facilities in the country.

Again, there are always, in every organization, instances where there are bad apples. But the fact of the matter is, as an institution, in terms of law enforcement, these agents are out there every single day protecting this country; and to attack not just an individual decision but an institution is, again, the real sort of level that we are watching happen here with the pushback on the Mueller investigation, and it is just totally unacceptable.

As I said, on the 1-year anniversary, it has proved its credibility, the Mueller team, in terms of concrete, real results. And the courts and, as I said, the Department of Justice have repeatedly reconfirmed and reaffirmed the rationale for the creation of the Mueller investigation and the fact that it is operating totally within the mission and charge that was given.

So I think it is important for all of us to continue to raise our voices and defend the rule of law and institutions that are out there to protect our Constitution and our democracy.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, we will wrap up this portion of our Special Orders because I know we have another subject that Ms. PINGREE and Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. TONKO would like to address.

Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of this subject can't be overstated: the impact on elections; the trust in our system of elections; the trust in our law enforcement; the trust in our courts; the trust, which is attacked by this President and too many others, of our institutions of the press, whether it is The Washington Post or The New York Times or somebody investigating.

And it goes to trust of this Nation and what we have formed. And when you have got outside influences like Russia sticking their nose in our business and trying to put their thumb on the scale as to who should run this Nation, I can't think of a higher crime.

□ 2000

And we know the National Security Advisor for Donald Trump, Michael Flynn, indicted; Rick Gates, campaign advisor for the Trump campaign; George Papadopoulos, foreign affairs

advisor for Trump campaign; Richard Pinedo; Alexander van der Zwaan—all indicted, sentenced, or at least pled guilty. Indicted still: the campaign chairman, Paul Manafort; 13 Russian nationals; and 3 Russian entities.

This investigation needs to get to the bottom of all of this. We have got to try to figure out: Is there anything being hidden? Is there anything that we, as Americans, should know about this interference that we don't know today? And our law enforcement officers, from Robert Mueller to the FBI to the cop on the beat, need to be allowed to finish this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California and my friend from Connecticut. I yield to my friend from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) because she seems to be ready to go here. I don't know about her two colleagues, the one from New York and the one from Oregon, because they seem to be kind of getting ready but not nearly as ready as my friend, Congresswoman PINGREE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Maine.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PERLMUTTER for yielding, and I thank him for, really, the eloquent conversation he has been having for the last half an hour about the extreme importance of the investigation that is going on and recognizing the fact that this is the 1-year anniversary, and obviously, we still have a long ways to go. This is a very critical issue, and we need to continue to support Robert Mueller and the work that he is doing, and I am very grateful for all that is going on.

May 17 is not only the first anniversary of that investigation, but it is also the day we started the debate on the farm bill. And for those of you who have been following this, you will see that this week there are going to be amendments and general debate around this particular bill. I have also been joined by a couple of my colleagues from SEEC, the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, because we want to talk specifically tonight about how this farm bill harms the environment and conservation.

You are going to hear all kinds of things about the farm bill. Some of the most egregious challenges are within the nutrition title, which takes up about 80 percent of the resources of the farm bill. But it is very important to talk about the role of the environment in this bill.

A lot of people don't think about the farm bill as an environmental bill, but actually, farmland accounts for over 40 percent of our Nation's land, and what happens to farms and working forests has a huge impact on water quality, on wildlife, on environmental health, and the farm bill contains many provisions, some of which people don't often know that much about, that are important to conservation programs for farmers.

Farmers understand why it is important to care for the land that takes

care of them. They know that conservation practices ensure that the resource remains sustainable while helping them to save money, preparing for environmental issues like drought and extreme weather. Conservation practices that sequester carbon in the soil, put more organic matter in the soil, have a huge impact on our ability to sequester carbon, which we all know is very important to issues around climate change.

I just want to go over a few of the highlights, or you could say the low lights, of this bill when it comes to environmental practices, and then I am happy to share with several others who would like to talk about some of the programs, and we will have a little dialogue about it.

One of the things that happens is it eliminates the Conservation Stewardship Program. These are financial incentives for farmers to implement long-term conservation practices that benefit wildlife and natural resources, which also help their bottom line. Elimination of this program is about \$1 billion cut for conservation.

Also, within the program, they are folding in the Conservation Stewardship Program into another program called EQIP, and these two programs will be worked together. And while maybe that sounds like it is streamlining in Maine, we are worried that they will have far less in resources overall.

In Maine, programs have been particularly important to helping what has been a growth in small farms in our State and more resources to our farmers. People have built hoop houses, which extend our season and allow you to grow more in the early season and into the late season, helped with wells, composting facilities, a variety of other things. Now we are going to combine those programs, have less in resources, and farmers will just be fighting for far less dollars.

The bill also eliminates a lot of mandatory funding. And one program I wanted to mention was the REAP program, Renewable Energy for America Program. I think many of us really care about renewable resources and allowing our farms and rural businesses to have more energy efficiency, use alternative energy improvements. This helps to reduce their environmental impact, and, again, their costs. It is very difficult to make a good living on a farm, and that has to be factored in as well.

In Maine, the REAP program has helped install solar power, helped maple syrup producers reduce energy costs, generated energy from biomass, built more efficient processing systems, built an anaerobic digester, and so much more. So this is also a very critical program that is now going to be changed in the way it is funded, and that means we can't count on it going into the future.

There are a lot of policy riders—and I am hoping my colleagues will talk

about a few more of them—that will hurt farmers and the health of rural communities in many ways, and these have no place in the farm bill.

One of them that I have heard a lot about from my constituents—and there is a lot of talk about—is the King amendment—the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING)—that would preempt local and State laws, which would preempt many of those laws that impact pesticides and animal welfare.

Now, Maine, where we are a very outspoken State, we believe in agriculture, and we care deeply about the environment. We already have 30 communities that have local pesticide laws restricting pesticides. That would be eliminated under this because they would be preempted.

We have other laws about crate sizes, breeding crate sizes, puppy mills; any of those kinds of things that regulate animal practices, States would no longer be allowed to do. This is not a good States' rights issue. It is bad for the issues that we care about, and we should not allow this amendment to pass.

There are also a variety of issues that would impact the Endangered Species Act. Now, we are lucky in Maine. Since 1978, when the impacts of DDT had reduced the number of bald eagles to about 20 nesting pairs, once that was eliminated and there was no more DDT, fast forward to today, in the last count, we have 500-plus bald eagles in our State. Almost everywhere in our State you can see a bald eagle out there fishing, doing its work.

Well, the language in this bill would say that when reviewing pesticides and herbicides, there would no longer be any requirement for the EPA to consult expert wildlife agencies to identify and minimize impact to endangered species. Many of us are deeply worried about the effect on pollinators like bees and butterflies, which are critically important to agriculture. We can't exist without pollinators, and this is a terrible time to put them in further danger.

I will just mention one more and then yield to a couple of my colleagues who are ready to speak. One provision in the farm bill would undermine the National Environmental Policy Act, that is, NEPA. Again, those are critically important reviews that go on in anything that we do. To weaken that would harm our communities, our environment, and our public health.

So I have done a little bit of a broad overview, and I could talk about things that frustrate me in this farm bill all night long, but I want to yield to one of my great colleagues from the State of Oregon, someone who represents the other Portland, as we say. I have the first Portland.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly, I yield back to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maine. The farm bill—and agriculture and the environment—is always something she cares a

lot about, whether it is conversations about milk or eggs or local control, which is really sort of at the heart of her concern about this bill, that, you know, Maine, and its local governments and the State as a whole, cares about its environment and it cares about its agriculture. And she, as a Representative, makes that clear to the rest of us how important it is to her State.

So I thank the gentlewoman from Maine, and I now yield to my friend from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing us to join in this conversation, and I strongly identify with what the Representative from the other Portland just said.

In fact, North Haven, I am reflecting right now that, in 3 short months, during the summer recess, I plan on sitting on a deck looking out at North Haven and enjoying looking for those eagles that have been rescued and are very much in evidence in her beautiful part of the country.

She is not just an advocate for the environment and for agriculture; she is a practitioner. And I have had an opportunity to tour her magnificent farm in North Haven that is really a model of sustainability, showing really what value-added agriculture is, reclaiming the history of that island in terms of the bounty of the land.

But that doesn't happen by accident. It takes commitment and follow-through and, step by step, trying to harness the forces of sound agricultural policies, good environmental stewardship to be able to add value while it protects the environment.

So I am looking forward to seeing her handiwork again this summer, and I deeply appreciate her leadership tonight in terms of the environment, what she cares about in terms of nutrition, celebrity chefs. There are a whole range of things, and it underscores why we are here talking about the farm bill.

It is the most important legislation that most Americans pay no attention to. It is the most important piece of legislation that, sadly, few in the House of Representatives really drill down and look at what is in it. It will be the most important health bill that this Congress will pass or consider for the remainder of this session. We still subsidize a diet that makes Americans sick, paying too much to the wrong people to grow the wrong food in the wrong places, and it is the most important environmental bill, bar none.

If you care about emissions of greenhouse gasses, the agriculture sector plays a role—9 percent, it is claimed statistically. But if you factor in all of the inputs in terms of pesticides and transportation, refrigeration, you will find that it is far greater than that, and these are elements that are within our control.

The gentlewoman referenced the conservation programs. It is interesting to me, in reading the guidance that the

administration has put out about the farm bill and what they tout, they want to promote independence. They don't want to support dependency. They want to have higher performance standards for projects that they are involved with, yet the farm bill that is being considered now by the Republicans undercuts performance standards.

When we eliminate, as the gentleman said, the Conservation Reserve Program, only one out of four conservation grants is currently funded. There is not enough money, and they are going to reduce it \$1 billion more while eliminating the Conservation Stewardship Program. It is also stunning when there is an opportunity to provide performance standards for conservation.

I have offered an amendment before the Rules Committee that would apply conservation standards, that you get conservation funding if you produce results. But that is not the way it works now.

The EQIP program, which hands out grants to help farmers improve the environment, you look at the practices that are authorized under this bill, that are funded under this bill, there are six or eight of them that actually hurt the environment. They are not required to enhance their environment. We pay for things like fencing and hog lagoons for big operations that ought to be able to pay their own way, and they take that money that would be available to other farmers and ranchers to be able to fund programs that would actually enhance the environment.

I deeply appreciate the gentleman's leadership, and I appreciate what my friend from Colorado has offered up. We have other colleagues here who have some things to say. I will hang tight for a moment in case we run out of speakers, but I want to cheer folks on because it is time that we put the spotlight on this egregious bill, the King amendment, the lack of accountability, and wasteful spending.

□ 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for those comments, who, as always, is very knowledgeable and passionate about the things that really matter to most Americans, and I thank him for being such an advocate for the environment, always, every day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend. I know Mr. POLIS has some things he would like to add to this conversation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the senior gentleman from Colorado for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss a couple of the terrible conservation and environmental bills that affect the district I represent, our State, and our country.

As the gentleman from Oregon mentioned, the elimination of the Conservation Stewardship Program, a pro-

gram that has been successful to help preserve over 70 million acres, is, frankly, inexcusable. The Conservation Stewardship Program supports farmers, ranchers, and owners of forests who want to pursue high-level conservation stewardship activities. It is important to protect our watershed that our towns and communities rely on, to keep our air clean, to sequester carbon, to maintain diverse habitats for wildlife, and, yes, to keep our farms productive and sustainable in the long term.

Working lands conservation programs are so popular that the Natural Resources Conservation Service wound up having to have a waiting list. It had to turn away almost three-quarters of the qualified applicants. Under the proposal today it would have to turn away 100 percent of applicants.

Now, they claim that they are consolidating some programs into the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, or EQIP, but, frankly, those programs are very different. Whereas, the Conservation Stewardship Program helps farmers and ranchers implement advanced conservation and stewardship systems to help preserve and protect the resources on their lands.

EQIP is more of an introduction or on-ramp to working lands conservation. It is on a one-time basis to help a specific conservation practice. It is not a program that designed, nor does it provide, assistance for long-term sustainability.

That is why the Conservation Stewardship Program is so important for our forest health. Switching gears to our national forests, it seems that some Members of this body are still seeking to erode protections for our national forests.

One example in this bill, the Tongass National Forest, in Alaska, which is one of the crown jewels of our National Forest System, faces a huge threat with two amendments. One of those amendments in the bill, which was already ruled in order last night without any debate, would exempt all of the Federal forests in Alaska—more Federal forests than any State in the country—to one of the most important conservation safeguards: the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule.

The second amendment would overturn the Tongass forest plan, which protects roadless areas and other ecologically important lands from unsustainable logging, and charts a transition away from taxpayer subsidized, industrial scale, old-growth logging, to better and new forms of sustainable economic development.

Our country's old-growth forests are, frankly, a National treasure. Clear-cutting ancient forests not only compromises our public lands; but it devastates and fragments habitat for wildlife, it introduces invasive species that compete with native species; and, yes, it pollutes the drinking water supplies for as many as 60 million people.

The Roadless Rule is very important because it provides a balanced protec-

tion between our old-growth forests and public roads, and hydropower projects. Its application in Alaska has a very positive impact on community access and economic development, and we need to maintain the rule.

As representatives and stewards of our forests, under the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it is absolutely critical to protect our public lands. From the Clean Water Act to NEPA, which this bill would devastate for projects that are 6,000 acres or less, to the Endangered Species Act, which has had so many great successes, we need to protect the tools we have to secure a safe environment and a diverse habitat for our wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado, and others, for speaking out on the important environmental provisions in this bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Colorado for bringing up these important points, and I wish him well as he goes on about a campaign for Governor in the State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), my friend, again, a tireless advocate for the environment. Obviously, New York produces, especially in his part of the State, a lot of farms and a lot of agriculture. This is a subject that he knows well.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I speak, this evening, joining with some members of SEEK. You heard earlier from the gentleman from Maine, who spoke of the SNAP cuts, the nutrition cuts. Congresswoman PINGREE is absolutely right: It is a big portion of the farm bill.

But, beyond that, I am horrified with this current farm bill that proposes many harmful provisions that would completely disregard some very bedrock environmental laws. As one of the cochairs of SEEK, which aims for sustainable outcomes for energy and environment policy, you must speak to this bill, because it is so dreadful as it relates to our environmental and energy policy.

This bill weakens environmental and public health protections against pesticides, many of which were established to protect the health of our children. Those protections that would be destroyed by this farm bill include allowing companies to spray pesticides into our waterways without even obtaining a Clean Water Act permit, endangering sources of drinking water and places where we swim and where we fish; preempts local governments from taking steps to protect their communities from pesticides; and weakens protections for endangered species by eliminating the requirement to consult with Federal wildlife experts.

These pesticides can elevate the risk of cancer and other chronic diseases.



Removal of Clean Water Act protections, and the preemption of local efforts to protect communities, puts our public health at great risk.

The International Agency for Research on Cancer in 2015 classified the pesticide glyphosate as a probable human carcinogen. The United States Geological Survey routinely finds glyphosate in our United States waterways.

EPA's scientific review found that the pesticide chlorpyrifos in water and on food is unsafe for children and increases the risk of learning disabilities. Prenatal exposures to this chemical are associated with reduced IQ and delayed motor development. Whenever chlorpyrifos is sprayed, it can cause immediate and long-term health harms to kids, to farmers, to farmworkers, and others who are exposed.

These provisions also put our wildlife at risk. Decades ago, bald eagles and peregrine falcons were brought to the brink of extinction by the pesticide DDT.

To address such issues, the EPA is required, under the Endangered Species Act, to consult with the expert Federal wildlife agencies when approving chemicals that can harm endangered species. This bill eliminates that requirement, threatening endangered wildlife and hindering recovery of imperiled species.

Our farm bill is about supporting farmers, strengthening communities, and providing food for America. Rolling back public health and wildlife protections has no place in this bill.

The cuts of \$23-plus billion in SNAP benefits, kicking an estimated 1 million households off of the program and affects 265,000 children out of free school meals is torturous in its own right.

Someone, today, earlier said: When I was a kid, my money for food programs, for lunch programs was taken by the school. Now Congress is taking the money for school lunch programs away from the kids.

Cuts of \$800 million in conservation funding are devastating to our environment, and the cutting of vital funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency in our rural communities, which will eliminate the Rural Energy for America Program, is going to be a great consequence of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I was compelled to come to the floor and join with my colleagues as a member of SEEK that is looking for sustainable energy and environment outcomes to speak against this bill, which is going to hurt the progress over the last decades that speaks to agriculture in America, farming in America, and the quality of life for children and families across this great land.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for those comments. I can say, to those who are listening, that Mr. TONKO serves on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and speaks up about

the environment and about concerns about chemicals, the effects on public health, the effects on the environment, and I thank him for his advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), my friend, for his thoughts on this particular subject, a gentleman who is an outdoorsman, and talks about the farms and the cheeses of Wisconsin. He is here as a real advocate for his State. I am sorry that he has had the Green Bay Packers and they have fallen on hard times.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, even with that introduction, I thank my very good friend and colleague from Colorado for holding this Special Order.

I am honored actually to be on the House floor with so many of my esteemed colleagues, who have taken a back seat to no one when it comes to standing up for our natural resources: for the conservation title, specifically, of this farm bill. And I am looking at the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) and the work that she has done on agriculture policy throughout the years, and her service to her district: the introduction of the local Farms Act that she has worked on in a bipartisan fashion. My friend from Oregon, who is one of the foremost thinkers and leaders when it comes to environmental policy, but the impact on our family farms throughout our country.

This is an important moment, because this is one of the more important bills that we have to consider in this session of Congress: the renewal of the farm bill. We have a chance every five or six years to take a look at the program to see what is working, what isn't, and fix what isn't working to make sure that we are empowering our farmers with the tools and resources that they need to be successful.

I come from one of the largest agriculture producing districts in the Nation, in rural western and north-central Wisconsin. It has been tough in farm country in the last few years, given where commodity prices have been, and, yes, where milk prices have been falling for the last 3 years. It is very difficult for these individual entities and family farms to succeed with this very tough market that they are facing right now.

That is why taking our time to get this farm bill done right is the appropriate thing to do. But, unfortunately, the farm bill in its current form misses the mark in so many areas.

There has been a lot of discussion about what is happening under the conservation title, the elimination of the Conservation Stewardship Program, which has worked incredibly well, and has been very successful for my family farmers in Wisconsin. I come from a very hilly area with bluffs and coulees: a lot of highly sensitive and erodible land and a lot of water source.

Being able to use a Conservation Stewardship Program that is built in for the flexibility for what my farmers need, and the technical assistance that they need, to put good conservation

plans in practice is very important. As the previous speaker highlighted, too, the demand is overwhelming. Three out of every four farmers nationwide applying for conservation funding assistance are currently turned away because of the inadequacy of resources.

By eliminating the Conservation Stewardship Program and rolling it into the EQIP program eliminates \$800 million worth of base funding. This comes on the heels of the previous farm bill, where there were \$8 billion worth of cuts under the conservation title. We are not stepping up to address the need that exists in farm country; instead, we are rolling it back even further.

But the problems with this farm bill don't just end under the conservation title. Under title I commodity programs, they are lifting the payment limitation caps that had been in existence for some time. Now, pass-through entities will be able to qualify for these subsidy payments.

I think the average viewer, and average taxpayer, would be shocked to see the mailing addresses for these commodity subsidy programs going to New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, ending up on the doorsteps of multi-millionaires and billionaires, who are receiving government subsidies under the commodity program. That is wrong. These people won't even set foot on a family farm. Rolling back any protections that exist under the multiple entity rule, which means that husbands, wives, daughters, sisters, sons, aunts, and uncles can qualify for the same payments, is also wrong.

Finally, there is an opportunity to tighten the crop insurance program. Right now, it is prohibited from even tracking these crop insurance premium subsidies. You can't even track it to the individual.

If there is one thing that this farm bill should demand is complete transparency. The American taxpayer deserves to know where their tax dollars are going, but they can't now under the crop insurance program. That is something else that I am trying to fix with an amendment. We are going to find out later today what amendments are made in order to try to improve this bill. It may be beyond salvage at this point coming out of the House, but we still have time later this year to do the right thing to make sure that this farm bill speaks to the needs of our family farmers back home and not to the powerful special interests here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague again for yielding me this time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Wisconsin for those comments. He makes so many good points, and he does it in a way that really is understandable by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my friend, if he wishes, to close.

□ 2030

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate that.

It has been fun working with Congresswoman PINGREE, with my friend RON KIND, looking at these programs over the years.

There is a great essay written by Marion Nestle, an author, a professor of nutrition at NYU, and the title of the essay is "The Farm Bill Drove Me Insane." As she tried to actually teach a class about the farm bill to graduate students, she dove into it and found that it was just hopelessly complex.

What I appreciate about working with the gentlewoman from Maine and the gentleman from Wisconsin is it doesn't have to be that complex.

We ought to be able to strip this away, have a full and honest debate, and get to the basics that make the most difference for the American public.

Hopefully this thing will collapse, and we will have some time this year to work on it and make it better.

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

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2140

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-679) on the resolution (H. Res. 900) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4850. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a status report on the account balance in the Defense Cooperation Account, as of March 31, 2018, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2608(e); Public Law 101-403, Sec. 202(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 1064(7)); (125 Stat. 1587); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4851. A letter from the Director, Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Promoting Voluntary Post-Award Disclosure of Defective Pricing (DFARS Case 2015-D030) [Docket: DARS-2015-0051] (RIN: 0750-A175) received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4852. A letter from the Director, Defense Pricing/Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Amendments Related to Sources of Electronic Parts (DFARS Case 2016-D013) [Docket: DARS-2016-0014] (RIN: 0750-A192) received April 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4853. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2017 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); June 26, 1934, ch. 750, title I, Sec. 102(d) (as amended by Public Law 95-630, Sec. 501); (92 Stat. 3680); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4854. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Definitions and Selection Criteria that Apply to Direct Grant Programs (RIN: 1855-AA13) received April 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4855. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Konjac glucomannan; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0249; FRL-9976-60] received May 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Duddingtonia flagrans strain IAH 1297; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0294; FRL-9977-31] received May 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Permitting and Public Participation for Air Quality Permit Applications [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0124; FRL-9976-95-Region 6] received May 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Motor Vehicle Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R02-OAR-2017-0101; FRL-9977-61-Region 2] received May 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 2012 PM2.5, 2010 NO2, 2010 SO2, and 2008 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0315; FRL-9977-49-Region 4] received May 7, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4860. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State of North Dakota Underground Injection Control Program; Class VI Primacy Approval [EPA-HQ-OW-2013-0280; FRL-9976-92-OW] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4861. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — New York: Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R02-RCRA-2018-0034; FRL-9974-06-Region 2] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4862. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlormequat Chloride; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0661; FRL-9974-42] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4863. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus subtilis strain FMCH002; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0186; FRL-9971-55] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4864. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus licheniformis strain FMCH001; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0185; FRL-9971-54] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4865. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Hospital, Medical, and Infectious Waste Incineration (HMIWI) Units [EPA-R07-OAR-2018-0005; FRL-9977-10-Region 10] received April 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4866. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Visible Emissions and Particulate Matter [EPA-R06-OAR-