

Medal of Honor, which was bestowed upon only 78 veterans for the Nation during the war.

I appreciate representing Fort Jackson, which was created in 1917 as the United States entered the Great War. Each time I meet our soldiers, I am so impressed by their professionalism of the troops and their leadership.

Let us never forget the sacrifices to preserve America while liberating occupied allies. Freedom is not free.

I thank VA representatives Lee Becker and Brendon Gehrke for the commemorative pin.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### YEMEN RULE

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, last night, House Republicans on the Rules Committee voted to undermine our democracy by blocking the American people and Members of Congress from having a debate and the ability to vote on a bill that would end U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen: a war that has created the world's worst humanitarian disaster in generations, leaving 22 million people in dire need of humanitarian aid, tens of thousands of civilians killed, and many more vulnerable to mass starvation, famine, and cholera outbreaks.

Don't be fooled. If Congress and this administration truly were concerned about the plight of the Yemeni people and peace, all U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's atrocities would end now.

Instead, last night, on the Rules Committee, Republicans voted to shut down debate to prevent a vote that would end U.S. support for Saudi Arabia in Yemen.

Later today, Congress has the opportunity to do the right thing. We are faced with a choice.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on House Resolution 1142 so that Congress can fulfill our constitutional role, debate, and vote on this critical issue. It is long overdue that we end U.S. complicity in Saudi Arabia's atrocities. We must end all U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen now.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Adoption Month.

During this month, we celebrate and reflect on the life-changing act of adoption. Many parents and families across America open up their homes, and their hearts, to children in search of a stable support system; to children in

search of a forever home. Unfortunately, there are so many children in the foster care system who are still waiting to find a permanent home.

In 2017, more than 442,000 children and teenage youth were in U.S. foster care. More than 59,000 of these children were adopted through the system, and we must always strive to help more children find a home.

All children deserve a permanent family that can provide them with love, support, and encouragement so they can reach their full potential in life.

Mr. Speaker, during National Adoption Month, we recognize the unconditional love and support adoptive parents provide to their children, and we hope that all children will soon be welcomed into a loving family because they deserve no less.

#### DEMOCRATS ARE COMMITTED TO WORK FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ON DAY ONE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Michiganders went to the polls and elected a new Democratic majority.

Because of this, I have the privilege of welcoming four new Michigan Democratic Members of Congress, folks who are committed to passing meaningful policies that will help everyday Americans. This means reducing the cost of healthcare. Prescription drug prices are too high. No one should have to choose between filling a prescription and feeding their family.

These new Members are ready to work to protect Social Security and Medicare from cuts that Republicans have been proposing. We are pleased that we are going to be able to have these new allies in this fight.

My own hometown of Flint knows firsthand the price of failing to invest in infrastructure. It is important that this Democratic majority advance a broad and meaningful infrastructure bill to fix our broken roads and bridges, and to repair our damaged water systems.

It is past time that we took on these issues. I am anxious to welcome these new Members of Congress who are committed to moving this bold agenda forward.

#### TRIBUTE TO MAJOR BRENT TAYLOR

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, as we recognize Veterans Day this week, I would like to pay tribute to the life and sacrifice of Major Brent Taylor.

Major Taylor and I had the great privilege of serving together as mayors of each of our hometowns in Utah.

Brent first enlisted after the terrorist attacks on September 11 and

quickly became a major in the National Guard. He served in Afghanistan and twice in Iraq before returning to Afghanistan for what would become his fourth and final tour.

On November 3, Major Taylor was tragically killed in an insider attack by one of those he was trying to help.

As our communities, State, and Nation mourn this tragic loss, his dear wife, Jennie, reminded us why so many choose to serve this great country. In her words:

The price of freedom surely feels incredibly high to all those of us who know and love our individual soldier. But the value of freedom is immeasurable to all who know and love America, and all that she represents.

Let us never forget those who have given their lives, their families, and their futures for our precious freedoms.

May God bless the Taylor family and others who grieve, and may God bless America.

#### HONORING VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, every time I go home, the people of Kansas never cease to inspire me. This Veterans Day, it was my hometown of Great Bend and my home county of Barton County who inspired me.

On Veterans Day, not only did we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the armistice ending World War I, but we also dedicated a new veterans memorial and veterans cemetery. I was so proud to be part of this dedication ceremony and join the 300 Kansans who braved snow and sleet in freezing cold to honor our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be part of such a community which holds veterans in such high esteem.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1546

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6784, MANAGE OUR WOLVES ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 19, 2018, THROUGH NOVEMBER 26, 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1142 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1142

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6784) to provide for removal of the gray wolf in the contiguous 48 States from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife published under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 19, 2018, through November 26, 2018—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall not apply to House Concurrent Resolution 138.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1142, providing for further consideration of H.R. 6784, the Manage our Wolves Act. The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have reintroduced the underlying legislation considered in this rule today, H.R. 6784, the Manage our Wolves Act, to return management of the gray wolf species to the States. The States are best equipped to provide more effective and accountable management that responds to the needs of the ecosystem, other species, as well as local communities.

On June 13, 2013, under the Obama administration, the Department of the

Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service published in the Federal Register a proposed rule that would have removed the gray wolf from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. This determination was made after Fish and Wildlife evaluated the classification status of gray wolves currently listed in the contiguous United States under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and found the “best available scientific and commercial information indicates that the currently listed entity is not a valid species under the act.”

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Endangered Species Act is to recover species to the point where they are no longer considered endangered or threatened. The gray wolf is currently found in nearly 50 countries around the world and has been placed in the classification of least concern for risk of extinction by the Species Survival Commission of the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

Some of my colleagues have asked, well, if Fish and Wildlife has proposed to delist the species, why haven't they done so?

That is a completely fair and reasonable question. Unfortunately, it is due to the fringe environmentalist efforts that any action from moving forward under the law has been stalled. So long as the courts are abused to prevent the proper adjudication of the law, we will not see progress made.

It is because of this exploitation of the law that communities like those in central Washington suffer the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State, the great State of Washington, the gray wolf is not listed in just the eastern third of the State, forcing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to rely on an arbitrary political boundary when delineating and managing a species.

I am sorry to share with you, Mr. Speaker, that as it turns out, surprisingly, wolves don't know boundaries or borders.

The arbitrary nature of this current status of the law is broken, and it is impairing the ability of Fish and Wildlife managers on the ground to properly manage the species, as well as the ecosystem, including the harm it poses on other indigenous species.

Mr. Speaker, this is why Congress, as a coequal branch, must act. This legislation directs the U.S. Department of the Interior to follow through with the proposed rule and delist the gray wolf from the list of endangered species.

We have a responsibility to protect the incredibly diverse species both in Washington State and across this country. These efforts to protect our wildlife species must be based on sound science and an open, transparent process. Unfortunately, that is far from the case when it comes to the process dictating endangered species policies, particularly in this case of the gray wolf.

For years now, Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife has asked the Federal Government to delist the gray wolf and provide relief from the burdensome, broken process dictating species management. I have received letters from the director of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, one in 2015 and one earlier this year. In them, the letters read: “Dear Congressman NEWHOUSE, The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife appreciates your continued assistance to encourage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to complete the delisting of the gray wolf and remove it from Federal protection under the Endangered Species List.”

It continues: “In 2008, the first wolf pack was documented in Washington State. Today, we have 22 known packs. During this time, the State's wolf population has increased by an average of more than 30 percent per year. . . . As demonstrated with the current rate of recovery, the Department is well suited to facilitate the recovery and management of wolves across the State. . . . Under the current Federal designation and management, we cannot fully implement our plan in the western two-thirds of the State. To ensure ongoing success in wolf recovery, the Federal listing needs to keep pace with the on-the-ground recovery status and allow the State to fully implement its management plan. Therefore, I support your efforts to advance the delisting of wolves and return management to the State.”

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the two letters I referenced.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE,

*Olympia, WA, April 27, 2015.*

Hon. DAN NEWHOUSE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NEWHOUSE: The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) would appreciate your assistance to encourage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to complete the delisting of the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) and remove it from federal protections under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). As you may know, gray wolves in the western two-thirds of Washington State remain federally classified as “endangered” and are under federal management.

The original delisting proposal was published on June 13, 2013, and then on March 27, 2014, the USFWS closed the second round of public comments. The Department submitted letters of support for delisting in December 2013 and March 2014. While we have been working closely with the USFWS at the state, regional and headquarter levels to ensure we are meeting our shared conservation and recovery objectives, we are concerned with the lack of progress on federal delisting.

Washington has a strong Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that has received broad support, and we are committed to maintaining a viable wolf population in Washington. The Department is well positioned to facilitate the recovery and management of wolves across the state.

Protection under Washington State Laws—The Department has state-specific authority (RCW 77.12.020 and 77.15.120) to designate and protect species at risk of extinction and has

classified wolves as endangered since 1980, an action akin to federal protection granted under ESA). Wolves will remain protected until their population reaches the levels established in the state recovery plan.

The Department is equipped for wolf conservation and management—In 2013, the Washington State Legislature acted to provide \$1.6 million per biennium for wolf management from a permanent increase in the cost of personalized license plates. Since then, the Department has hired two permanent wolf biologists and has deployed 11 conflict specialists across the state to address wildlife conflict issues.

Wolves are recovering in Washington State—In 2008, the first wolf pack was documented in Washington State. Today we have 16 known packs. During this time our wolf population has increased by an average of more than 30 percent per year. At current rates, we expect to meet our recovery objects within six years. We want to have consistent management of wolves across the state of Washington. For us, successful wolf recovery means that we have a sustainable wolf population distributed throughout the state, the public accepts the presence of wolves on the landscape, and Washington citizens are confident in the Department's wolf management.

The Washington wolf management plan establishes strong expectations that livestock operators will use preventive strategies to avoid wolf-livestock conflict. But sometimes we may need to remove wolves that become habituated to livestock as a food source. Under the current federal designation and management, we cannot implement our plan in the western two-thirds of the state. Therefore, I ask you for any help you can provide to advance the federal proposal to delist wolves.

Thank you for considering this request. The Department is available to assist you with any information you may need.

Sincerely,

JAMES UNSWORTH, Ph.D.,  
*Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE,  
*Olympia, WA, May 15, 2018.*

Hon. DAN NEWHOUSE,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NEWHOUSE: The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) appreciates your continued assistance to encourage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to complete the delisting of the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) and remove it from federal protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). As you may know, gray wolves in the western two-thirds of Washington State are currently classified as "endangered" and are under federal management.

The USFWS published the original delisting proposal on June 13, 2013, and then on March 27, 2014, the USFWS closed the second round of public comments. The Department submitted letters of support for delisting in December 2013 and March 2014. To date, the USFWS has not released a decision notice on the federal status of gray wolves and we remain concerned with the lack of progress towards federal delisting.

Washington has a strong Wolf Conservation and Management Plan that has received broad support, and we are committed to maintaining a viable wolf population in Washington. As demonstrated with the current rate of recovery, the Department is well suited to facilitate the recovery and management of wolves across the state.

Protection under Washington State Laws—The Department has state-specific authority (RCW 77.12.020 and 77.15.120) to designate and

protect species at risk of extinction and has classified wolves as endangered since 1980, an action akin to federal protection granted under ESA. Wolves will remain protected until their population reaches the levels established in the state recovery plan.

The Department is equipped for wolf conservation and management—Since 2013, the Washington State Legislature has provided approximately \$1.5 million per biennium for wolf management from a permanent increase in the cost of personalized license plates. The Department uses that funding, in addition with other sources, to support 23 positions deployed across the state that address wolf conflict as well as other wildlife conflict issues.

Wolves are recovering in Washington State—In 2008, the first wolf pack was documented in Washington State. Today we have 22 known packs. During this time, the state's wolf population has increased by an average of more than 30 percent per year. We want to have consistent management of wolves across the state of Washington. For us, successful wolf recovery means that we have a sustainable wolf population distributed throughout the state, the public accepts the presence of wolves on the landscape, and Washington citizens are confident in the Department's wolf management.

The Washington wolf management plan establishes strong expectations that livestock operators will use preventive strategies to avoid wolf-livestock conflict. But sometimes we may need to remove wolves that become habituated to livestock as a food source. Under the current federal designation and management, we cannot fully implement our plan in the western two-thirds of the state and the only means available for the USFWS to address wolf-livestock conflicts in the geographic area under the federal endangered designation is for the USFWS to attempt to relocate livestock-killing wolves.

To ensure ongoing success in wolf recovery, the federal listing needs to keep pace with the on-the ground recovery status and allow the state to fully implement its management plan. Therefore, I support your efforts to advance the delisting of wolves and return management to the state.

Thank you for considering this request. The Department is available to assist you with any information you may need.

Sincerely,

JOE STOHR,  
*Director.*

Mr. NEWHOUSE. So, Mr. Speaker, to close, I would just like to say that, as a farmer and a lifelong resident of central Washington State, I consider myself a conservationist and a steward of our rich natural heritage, and that includes our incredible wildlife.

State governments are fully qualified to responsibly manage gray wolf populations and are better able to meet the needs of local communities, ranchers, livestock, wildlife populations, and ecosystems.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are here today considering our first rule following a long district work period. During that time, we had a big national debate about the direction of our country. According to exit polling, the top issue for voters was healthcare and, in particular, protecting coverage from preexisting conditions.

But that is not what the bill before us addresses. Nor does it involve immigration, another top issue for voters, or strengthening the economy or combating gun violence. All of these are what our constituents just said was important to them.

But instead of doing anything on any of that, we are here today considering a bill to undermine endangered species protections. Are you kidding me?

And get this: Also, last night in the Rules Committee, the majority placed a provision in the rule that would remove the privileged status of Representative KHANNA's War Powers Resolution, H. Con. Res. 138. This resolution states that Congress never authorized the United States' support of Saudi-led forces in Yemen and would direct the President of the United States to end his support.

This measure is a privileged resolution under the terms of the War Powers Resolution, which provides that resolutions concerning the involvement of the U.S. military in armed conflict have a direct path to the floor to be debated and to be voted on.

The rules provide this privileged status because such questions are among the most important that the people's House can debate. Such privileged resolutions or a negotiated substitute have come before the House under Republican and Democratic majorities.

Yet, with this rule before us today, Republicans have taken the unprecedented step of striking this privilege, preventing us from doing our constitutional duty and foreclosing the only available mechanism to compel an up or down vote in Congress regarding our military involvement in the Yemen war.

As of this morning, this bill, introduced by Congressman KHANNA, has over 80 bipartisan cosponsors, including Democratic Whip HOYER and Ranking Members SMITH, LOWEY, ENGEL, and myself.

The U.S.-Saudi military campaign in Yemen has triggered the world's worst humanitarian crisis, prompting the late Saudi dissident Jamal Khashoggi to call for an end to the war. Published just weeks before his murder, Khashoggi's Washington Post column was headlined, "Saudi Arabia's crown prince must restore dignity to his country by ending Yemen's cruel war."

It is unconscionable for Republican leadership to take this unprecedented action to strip Members of their right to bring such measures to the floor for debate.

Mr. Speaker, what is the majority afraid of? We should be debating this.

Instead, the Republican majority continues to turn a deaf ear to this and many other issues.

We are 11 days away from our government running out of funding. Five appropriations bills have been signed into law so far. They have funded 75 percent of the government, but there is more work that we need to do.

We should be continuing that momentum and getting the job done, keeping the lights on, not wasting time considering a bill to attack an endangered species.

Or how about reauthorizing the National Flood Insurance Program that expires at the end of this month or putting a comprehensive reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act on the House floor that is set to expire December 7, not to mention the need to reauthorize the farm bill that expired back on October 1.

□ 1600

Our country's farmers are depending upon this Congress to put into place a new bill that provides them with certainty, especially in light of the trade war that President Trump has started; yet the majority has, instead, prioritized a bill that completely ignores all the important issues that we face in this country.

The American people have clearly had enough. They demanded a new direction and a new Congress that actually addresses what they care most about, and they demanded an end to this closed process. This rule marks the 102nd closed rule of this Congress. Now, let me repeat that: the 102nd closed rule. Mr. Speaker, that is a staggering number.

Now, I am not suggesting that every rule needs to be an open one or that there is never a time for a closed rule, but there is never a time for more than 100 closed rules. There is no justification for that at all.

Since the election, I heard my friends on the other side of the aisle express a hope that the next Congress is a more accommodating one. That is ironic since the Republicans have voted in lockstep for one closed rule after another, after another, after another.

But to them, I ask: Why wait? A Democratic majority will certainly be better than the current one. But Republicans don't have to wait until January. They could demand a more open process here today by voting against this closed rule.

This is your chance to prove that your newfound calls for openness are above more than politics. Vote against this record-breaking closed rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of points in response to my good friend from the State of Massachusetts. Certainly, there are a lot of important issues in front of us and things that we should and will be addressing. But I have to

say, as a representative of central Washington who represents communities that deal with wolf populations on a daily basis, I don't think it is fair or proper, even, for my good friend to minimize or diminish the importance of the issue that we have in front of us today. So with all due respect, the importance of managing wolves in our country deserves just as much attention as many of the other issues that my good friend from Massachusetts referenced.

Also, as relates to the Khanna resolution, just as you said, in just a few short weeks, your party will assume the majority. You will have the opportunity to hold the hearings and the markups and to take the votes of the all-important regular order that you continually talk about. I am looking forward to that. But forcing this type of vote on Members in the remainder of this Congress, in my view, is unnecessary at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), my good friend, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington State for bringing this rule to the floor and addressing this issue. It is literally one of great importance in my district and in the West.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the underlying bill, the Manage our Wolves Act, because we need to clarify the management of wolves in Oregon and put us on a path to follow the locally State-written Oregon wolf plan.

For years, Mr. Speaker, ranchers across my district have watched as wolf packs have grown. They harass cattle herds and they kill livestock and they are brutal.

When you lose a heifer, you don't just lose one cow. You have lost 10 years' worth of calves that will never be born and that will never be able to be sold. Those that aren't killed are harassed, often losing weight and value. They are chased all over by the wolf packs.

The cattle and sheep these ranchers raise are their livelihoods. Every day—sun, rain, or snow—they raise and care for these animals.

When a first-time mom is struggling to feed a new calf, the rancher nurtures them, sometimes even literally bringing them into their own home next to the wood stove to warm them up and keep the calf alive in the winter. That care makes it all the harder to come upon a calf that has been torn apart by wolves.

If you are of young age, or whatever, I would just give you a fair warning that this is a graphic picture of what happens when a wolf gets ahold of a calf.

A rancher wrote me earlier this year that three of her calves were attacked, and she described them as "wild-eyed with terror after being mutilated by wolves . . ."—just like this one you see here from a calf that was killed by

wolves in Wallowa County, ripped apart.

This rancher went on to write, "the rush of emotions one feels when you see an animal you have nurtured crying for help, panic in their eyes, searching for escape," she said no one wants to see that and described it as watching your worst horror movie in slow motion.

Now, the ranchers have done a lot in this effort. They have watched as attacks continue, though, despite their efforts to implement largely ineffective, nonlethal control techniques they were asked to do. Meanwhile, the issue at the heart of this matter is that there are arbitrary lines on a map that created a jurisdictional mess in my State of Oregon where wolves in eastern Oregon are managed by the State, and right across this highway they are managed by the Federal Government.

Today's legislation that we will consider fixes that by ensuring that all wolves in Oregon are removed from the Federal endangered species list. This would then return the management to the State and allow wolves, like other wildlife, to be managed under collaboratively developed Oregon law.

There are still challenges with State management; there is no doubt about that. We have seen times when the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Service has been slow to take action and implement the hard-fought agreements in the wolf plan to help prevent predation and control the wolf packs.

The State needs to step up and uphold these agreements, but those are issues we can work out as Oregonians. The last thing we need, however, is the Federal Government trying to micro-manage wolves from thousands of miles away.

This legislation that, hopefully, we are able to bring up because of this rule will get the Federal Government out of the way, will simplify the jurisdiction, and will place all wolves in Oregon under the State management plan.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington State, my good friend, Mr. NEWHOUSE, seemed to imply that it would be an inconvenience for us to have the House consider a measure on Yemen, and I am a little bit puzzled by that. The reason why Representative KHANNA took the step is because, for months, while this terrible carnage has unfolded in Yemen, this House has done nothing.

We just learned that the Saudi Government was directly involved in the killing of a Washington Post journalist and, again, nothing—nothing at all. The Republicans took the unprecedented step of basically derailing this privileged resolution. It is unprecedented.

Over 100,000 Yemeni children have already perished because of war-triggered

hunger and disease over the past 2 years. Why is the Republican leadership stripping us of the right to debate?

According to the U.N., 14 million people in Yemen—half the population—face an imminent and catastrophic famine not seen in 100 years if this war is not ended.

Why is the Republican leadership stripping our right to debate? I don't understand what they are afraid of. It is not like they have a lot to do. We are going to be talking about gray wolves today, and we are not voting on this until Friday. They have nothing going on. Certainly, we should have time to debate this important humanitarian issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN and Representative KHANNA for all they have done to help lead the efforts to end the United States' unauthorized war in Yemen.

Congress' sole responsibility over offensive use of force is outlined in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "Congress shall have power to . . . declare war." James Madison argued that this power "is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature." Yet, today, House Republicans are attempting to avoid their responsibilities by sneaking unrelated language into this rule which will prohibit consideration of a War Powers Resolution pertaining to the U.S.-Saudi war in Yemen.

To be clear, they took a bill about removing gray wolves from the endangered species list in North America and included a provision prohibiting even just the discussion of war in Yemen.

Now, there are rare Arabian wolves native to Yemen—about 1,000 to 2,000—roaming in the Middle East. *Canis lupus arabs* is a subspecies of gray wolf. But this is a wolf in sheep's clothing. This is the deprivileging of H. Con. Res. 138, which is just another abdication of our responsibilities as Members of Congress.

We are literally elected to make decisions about war and peace, and we are failing to do the most basic function of our job: to uphold the Constitution. We should at least have the courage to make the decisions about war and about conflicts in which we are entangling our constituents who serve in the military.

Today, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, Yemen is the worst humanitarian crisis on the planet, with the U.N. saying that 14 million people—half the population of Yemen—are either experiencing full-blown famine at the risk of death by starvation as soon as the end of the year.

Since 2015, U.S. forces have been backing the Saudi war by assisting in targeting, logistical support, and refueling deadly Saudi airstrikes in a war that has nothing to do with fighting al-Qaida.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, by reasserting Congress' authority over war, we can end active U.S. participation in a Saudi-led conflict in which the Saudis are imposing a blockade to literally starve millions of Yemenis to death. If the U.S. ends its involvement, Saudi leader Mohammed bin Salman will be forced to the negotiating table to end his brutal bombing campaign and blockade on food.

Even the Senate isn't afraid to take this up. In March, under Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, the Senate debated and voted on the unconstitutional war in Yemen: 44 Senators voted for the measure. A bipartisan group led that.

Unfortunately, rather than upholding our founding values, the leadership in this House has chosen to quietly insert a measure to block the House from debating the war.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this cynical tactic. Whether you agree or not about ending the illegal U.S.-Saudi war, vote against this rule so you can allow us to do our jobs and vote to do what we swore to uphold: our sole authority to debate and vote on war.

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

Mr. Speaker, nobody is afraid to debate anything here on the House floor. The fact is, though, that the U.S. is no longer providing the very support that the Khanna resolution seeks to cut off, making this action unnecessary.

It is based on a factually faulty premise: We are not involved in hostilities in Yemen, so the War Powers Act should not apply. As a result, even if this resolution passed both Chambers, DOD would not need to alter any of its activities.

Like I said, again, in a few short weeks, the Democrats will assume the majority. They will be able to hold all the hearings and markups and votes that they want on this matter, as it should be. Forcing this type of vote now, in the remainder of this Congress, in my humble opinion, is simply unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), my good friend.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, like many Montanans, I have a deep respect for our environment. I support protecting our rich and diverse wildlife and believe we can support multiple uses of land while conserving species. Unfortunately, we have seen environmental groups use misinformation and litigation to keep species listed that have already recovered.

In 2013, the Obama administration's Fish and Wildlife Service evaluated the gray wolf populations across the United States. It found that the species no longer warranted protection under the Endangered Species Act.

Rather than celebrating the recovery, serial litigants and extremists

filed lawsuits to stop the process. Montana has been fortunate. Through Federal legislation, the wolf has been delisted in Montana since 2011. Even without ESA protection, the species has continued to recover to a point nearing overpopulation.

While the focus of this legislation is wolves, a similar issue is playing out in Montana over the grizzly bear in the greater Yellowstone ecosystem. Just last year, the grizzly bear was delisted there. I celebrate the recovery of the species, but it had recovered more than a decade ago, according to scientists who have spent their lives studying the grizzly.

□ 1615

Using sound science and reliable data, they found the ecosystem reached maximum carrying capacity of the grizzly bear 16 years ago, but serial litigants have repeatedly thwarted the delisting efforts of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The unnecessary delay in delisting species has created unnecessary stress on the bears and impacted our communities. The overpopulation of the grizzly pushes them into our communities and increases the opportunities for attacks.

We must address the flaws in the Endangered Species Act to ensure species are delisted when they have recovered, and to prevent the law from being used as a bludgeoning tool for special interest groups to block critical projects.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 6784 and the rule that we are considering, the Manage Our Wolves Act, and I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, when my Republican friends want to dedicate the next 3 days to talking about gray wolves, people are being murdered every single hour in Yemen. The Saudi-led effort even bombed a school bus filled with innocent children. So it seems to me that there could be no more important time for debate in the House on ending U.S. military support for this war.

I just don't know what the Republican majority is afraid of. Privileged resolutions—I want my colleagues to understand this—by Members of this House, have always been allowed to be debated on this House floor, under Republican and Democrat majorities alike until now; until today. I don't know what the Republican majority is afraid of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in this rule, the wolves bare their fangs—not American wolves, but Saudis, who are willing to sever heads, dismember opponents, and bomb the innocent.

This rule is truly a wolf in wolf's clothing. By blocking a vote on whether America should continue to aid and abet Saudi atrocities, this Congress would remain an obedient lapdog to President Trump's impulses, and not the watchdog for American values.

The Saudi ruthless war in Yemen has created what so many have described as the largest humanitarian disaster on our planet today, and yet it continues. American support for Saudi atrocities is truly a stain on our Nation with which so many of our country members are not familiar.

But without American spare parts, American targeting, American weapons and bombs, and until recently, American refueling, this killing could not occur. My colleague mentioned the school bus. Forty children were murdered in August, and sprawled across the bomb that was next to their bus were words that meant: "Made in America." That is the message that we are sending there. That is where American tax dollars are going.

The Trump administration last week belatedly said it would stop refueling. That is insufficient. If we are to stop Saudi killing, we must stop all of the assistance that they are receiving.

Now, of course, there has been attention on Saudi murders of late in a different area: about one person, about the dismemberment of a legal American resident who was a leading journalist in this city.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, after taking the standing Trump approach of denying everything—saying he accepted the lies and the denials of the Saudis—Mr. Trump dodged again by saying, "I am going to leave . . . it up to Congress." And so what is this Congress doing about the Khashoggi atrocity? Absolutely nothing. That is what should have been in this rule, doing something about the sanctions and the disclosure.

Forty of us asked this past month for the administration to brief us on what they knew before Mr. Khashoggi was murdered, and whether they warned him about that, and we have had a deafening silence in response to our request on that, and on cutting off assistance to Yemen.

Even an audio of the gruesome murder of Mr. Khashoggi—we don't know whether it included the sound of the bone saw that the Saudis apparently used to dismember him—but even a murder will not cause some in this leadership to stand up to President Trump and this atrocious regime.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a Congress with the courage to end support for these crimes, to cease American sales to the Saudis, and to do something to hold Mr. Khashoggi's killers accountable.

But to say, wait until a much-improved new Congress comes into ses-

sion to do anything about it means that tonight and every day going forward to January 3, more children will be starved; will be victims of cholera; and will be victims of bombings and blockades. When this Congress has the power to do something about it now, we ought to act today by rejecting this rule.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, the organization that stands for finding solutions to the challenges that we face, not only in the Western United States, but all over the country to help steer debate back to the issue on the agenda that we are considering today.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support of H.R. 6784. Our Federal wolf policy has gone rabid. From a policy standpoint, we are foaming at the mouth. As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I have been trying for years now to return some sanity to the way the Fish and Wildlife Service classifies and manages our wolf populations on Federal lands and otherwise.

Make no mistake, everyone who votes for Mr. DUFFY's bill are big supporters of making sure wolf populations are robust, sustainable, and healthy for the next century and more. This bill is about fixing a Federal failure. Wolf populations across the country have made impressive gains and recovered quite nicely despite Federal involvement rather than because of it.

I have seen this firsthand, whether it comes to specific habitat listing decisions, or the rate at which the government adapts and responds to new situations on the ground. The Federal Government has been sluggish and out of touch when it comes to managing and recovering wolf populations. But the wolf has, nevertheless, persevered. It is now considered recovered by all relevant measures and metrics evaluating its status.

As a consequence, this bill makes necessary adjustments. It removes the species from the endangered list, as required by the statute for any recovered species, but empowers States to manage their unique habitats and populations in accordance with their storehouse of expertise and local knowledge.

State management plans developed for wolf populations are the antidote to repeat Federal blunders, both for this species and quite a few others. But for now, we are talking about the wolf and the fact that this bill will put States at ease.

We need to stop jerking their chain and hand them the reins. If we do, the wolf will have the best chance of continuing to make steady gains range-wide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 6784.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule which will pave the way for a vote on a bill that will summarily delist the gray wolf from protections under the Endangered Species Act by congressional fiat, in direct contradiction to our Nation's animal protection policies that have done so much to preserve the diversity of animal existence over the last 45 years.

In addition, in keeping with the sad track record of this Republican-controlled Congress, this is yet another closed rule, number 102 over the last 2 years, to be exact, that will prohibit consideration of any amendments.

Most egregious of all, however, this rule includes a totally non-germane provision that will deny debate of a separate resolution that will end U.S. participation in the Saudi-led coalition's intervention in Yemen's civil war.

This separate resolution, the Khanna resolution, which I am an original cosponsor of, will be effectively blocked from congressional consideration and debate by passage of this rule, despite the humanitarian crisis and indiscriminate coalition air strikes, which American forces have enabled with refueling, and with logistical and technical support over the last 3 years.

This bipartisan resolution deserves debate and as a coequal branch of government, Congress should not be shirking its duty once again by allowing U.S. military force to be used at the whim of the executive branch.

Sadly, this rule is another example of the complete abdication by the 115th Congress of its duty to act as a check on a coequal branch of government. This rule is another surrender by a weak-kneed majority on its way out the door to the executive branch.

To quote "The Hollow Men" by T.S. Eliot, this Republican 115th Congress is ending ". . . not with a bang but a whimper."

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), a member of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill that includes consideration of the Manage Our Wolves Act introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

The legislation would remove gray wolves from the Federal endangered species list and allow States like California to more effectively manage local populations. As the number of gray wolves continues to explode in population to nearly 6,000 in the lower 48 States, yet, the species continues to be classified as endangered for nearly 40 years now.

It really makes no sense because the numbers, they speak for themselves.



Even in my district in northern California, gray wolves have reemerged in 2015 after having been listed as extinct since 1924. Not surprisingly, the reemergence of the gray wolf has caused a number of problems for ranchers, their livestock, as well as citizens in their homes with their pets, and a decimation of the wildlife population.

Cattlemen, farmers, and local communities have continued to advocate for protections against wolves, to no avail. There had been efforts in recent years to delay or outright ban all nighttime hunting and trapping in California of other predators like coyotes, et cetera. Adoption of such a ban would have disastrous, unintended consequences for rural communities across my district and, indeed, across the West.

Any attempt to curtail or outright ban people in local communities from protecting themselves or their own private property from these predators, should be opposed. That is why I wrote a letter to the Fish and Wildlife director earlier this year urging the Service to delist the gray wolf range-wide based on overwhelming evidence supporting delisting, based on the Fish and Wildlife Service's own 5-year recommendation for delisting.

Management of gray wolf populations will continue to be extremely limited unless the species is removed from the Endangered Species Act. The fact remains, States are better equipped to responsibly manage the local wolf populations to meet the needs of local communities, ranchers, and livestock populations, as well as decimated wildlife populations.

We have seen gray wolf management successes in States like Montana, Wyoming, Michigan, and Wisconsin. It is past time that we are able to add States like California and others to this list as well. We need swift passage of this bill, because the endangerment and the damage being done to local ranchers with their livestock; the endangerment to communities, people in their homes out for a walk, is unnecessary and it is not right.

We need these tools for local control so we don't have to unnecessarily endanger and harass rural Americans with regulations that are poorly thought out and, indeed, ignoring the Fish and Wildlife Service's own recommendation to delist this species.

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

Let me begin by reminding my colleagues what the Republicans are proposing here, it is that the next 3 days be dedicated to the gray wolf. We are not debating healthcare, we are not debating the economy, or jobs, or keeping the government running, but it is to this.

They bring it to us under a rule that is completely closed, so there are no amendments to be made in order, and the rule is even worse because it basically undercuts the privilege resolution introduced by Mr. KHANNA so we could

debate this horrific war going on in Yemen.

□ 1630

It takes my breath away at the lengths that this majority goes through to basically deny Members of Congress the right to be able to talk about important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who is the author of the privileged resolution on Yemen.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCGOVERN for his moral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule that will deny Members of Congress an up-or-down vote about whether the United States should be complicit in the war in Yemen.

Let's be very clear. This is unprecedented in American history. Never has the Speaker of the House and the majority denied a Member of Congress a vote on matters of war and peace. This is basically rendering ineffectual the War Powers Act.

The War Powers Act was passed in a bipartisan fashion after Vietnam because our Nation said never again are we going to make the mistake of Vietnam. We are going to make sure that, if a Member of Congress calls for a vote, Members of Congress have the Article I, Section 8 responsibility to vote on matters of war and peace. What the majority is saying is that if the President of the United States and the Speaker believe we should be in war, then we should be in war, and it doesn't matter what Members of Congress think.

That is what they are doing with this rule.

Now, they are arguing that we are not complicit in the hostilities of Yemen to invoke the War Powers Act. But you can read every article written on this in the international press or the national press, and it starts with a simple line: the U.S.-backed Saudi coalition efforts in bombing.

Of course we are complicit. Do you think people in Yemen don't think we are complicit? Do you think people in the Middle East or our allies don't think we are complicit?

With due respect, Congressman NEWHOUSE says: Well, why not wait? Why not wait a few weeks until we are in the majority?

Mr. Speaker, special envoy Griffith in every report has said that 500,000 children will die in a matter of months. They don't have aid. They don't have nutrition.

Let's be very clear on what we are doing. While we are bombing the ports of Hodaïda, we are not allowing food and aid to get to those kids.

When history is written, they are not going to say that JIM MCGOVERN did this or RO KHANNA did this or NEWHOUSE did this. They are going to say: How did the Congress not allow a vote while hundreds of thousands of

kids were not allowed food and medicine?

That is not the America that I believe in. It is not the America that so many Republican colleagues believe in. There is a reason that our Founders gave Congress the power over war and peace, because we have to go and answer to our constituents.

I will tell you something. There is not a single American who wouldn't want the violence to end and allow food and medicine to get to those kids who are going to face death if we do nothing.

I plead with my Republican colleagues: Please vote "no" on this resolution. Let's have a debate. Let's have a debate about the starvation and the killing going on there and do the right thing for our Constitution and the world.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

We know what is going on in Yemen, so none of us can escape the responsibility we have to either endorse or ignore the suffering that is occurring there. Thousands of victims in Yemen—hundreds of thousands—are dying of starvation.

It is happening, in some cases, quickly. People living in their homes under a bomb die instantly. In other cases, the suffering is prolonged—badly injured and no medical help to ease the suffering, let alone save the life. But in the case of most, it is prolonged through starvation.

Children do not have access to their mother's milk, do not have access to the aid that is in the port but is getting bombed and can't be delivered. That is happening every single day.

The U.N. report said that, of the 28 million people in Yemen, about 20 million are in danger of humanitarian disaster. That is happening. There is no dispute that it is happening.

Here is the question: Right now, that is being done with the authority of the executive branch of the United States Government. It means that that suffering that is avoidable and hardly inevitable is being done in your name and in mine.

Mr. KHANNA has brought forth a resolution that allows us to have a debate on this floor as to whether we will condone the continuation of that policy of inflicting the loss of innocent life: women, children, and citizens of Yemen. This rule prohibits us from accepting responsibility as to whether we will condone or condemn or oppose that policy.

We have no justification for failing to do our job. Let us debate.

This policy of Saudi Arabia of inflicting massive civilian casualty and suffering is for what? What national interest of this country is at stake by allowing that to continue?

Some, including me, may say that this threatens our national interest because our national interest is to defend innocent life; it is not to kill innocent life. It is to stand with allies who are going to be honest and transparent with us as well as their own citizens.

This blank check that our administration has given to Saudi Arabia for massive killing that is occurring in Yemen or individual assassination that is occurring in Turkey is wrong.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Vermont an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the question for us is: Will we accept the minimal responsibility that we have in our job to have a debate and say no more, no more will this be done in our name?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, undermining endangered species protections isn't a national emergency. We shouldn't be prioritizing it today.

Not only is this rule a closed one, as you have heard from our side over and over and over again, Republicans took the unprecedented step of removing the privileged status of a resolution that would have given us the chance to debate the United States' support of the war in Yemen. We should be voting on this.

People are dying every minute in Yemen. Our silence and our inaction mean that we are complicit.

I have always believed that if the United States stands for anything, then we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. There was a time when the issue of human rights was a bipartisan concern. But it is clear that this administration doesn't give a damn about human rights. But that doesn't mean that this institution should follow suit. Human rights ought to be the centerpiece of our foreign policy.

There are innocent people being killed every single day. Children were riding to school in buses where the buses have been bombed, where these children have died, have been murdered, and all my Republican friends can say is: Oh, you can take care of that after January when you are in charge. We are just going to spend the next 3 days dedicated to the issue of gray wolves.

Really?

There is so much real work in front of us, including our most basic responsibility of funding this government and reauthorizing programs like the National Flood Insurance Program, the Violence Against Women Act, and the farm bill. I could go on and on and on. Education costs are skyrocketing. Americans are afraid coverage for their preexisting conditions will be ripped away by this administration and its al-

lies in Congress because you have tried to do it dozens and dozens and dozens of times. How about doing something about that?

It was interesting, during the campaign, my Republican colleagues were rushing to every microphone they could find to say that they somehow supported covering preexisting conditions. Let me remind everybody, and especially my Republican colleagues, that that was a Democratic idea that you opposed.

This was the worst election for Republican Presidents since Watergate. Maybe that is why Republicans are trying to rewrite history.

But here is another politically popular idea Republicans should follow: bringing an end to the most closed Congress in history. Let's let some sunlight in. Don't wait until January. Start today by voting against this closed rule and demand action on things that our constituents actually care about.

Just one final note, again, on this unprecedented move of basically denying us the right to debate this war in Yemen: I agree with what Mr. KHANNA said. History is going to look back on our inaction not only on the war in Yemen, but on our inaction dealing with the brutality of the Saudi regime.

I would have thought that when we came back that one of the first items up on the agenda would be holding the Saudi Government accountable. Instead, we got nothing. Not only we get nothing, you take the unprecedented step of denying a Member of this House the right that he has under the privileges of this House to debate this issue of war.

This is so wrong. This is damaging to the institution, and it shows a callous disregard for what is happening in Yemen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, do the right thing and vote against this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing for the consideration of H.R. 6784, the Manage our Wolves Act, wolves were once hunted to near extinction in the lower 48 States. The gray wolf was listed by the Federal Government as an endangered species in 1974. Today, though, gray wolves are thriving both in my State of Washington, as well as throughout the United States, with more than 5,000 wolves now living in the contiguous United States.

According to Washington State's Department of Fish and Wildlife, the State's wolf population has grown over the past 9 straight years to 22 packs that contain at least 120 wolves.

Mr. Speaker, the gray wolf reaching recovered status truly is an Endangered Species Act success story, and we should celebrate.

Mr. Speaker, permanently listing species under the Federal Endangered

Species Act is not how the process was ever intended to work. The process should rely on the best available science. It is a sign of progress that the species has recovered from the brink of extinction and no longer merits protection under the Federal Endangered Species Act. That is the key point here. While we seek to delist the gray wolf from the Federal ESA, we are empowering each State to manage their respective populations.

Washington State has a strong wolf conservation and management plan that has received broad support, and the State Department of Fish and Wildlife is committed to maintaining a viable wolf population in the State of Washington. Wolves remain protected in the State recovery plan, but so long as an arbitrary Federal line divides our State and, as you heard, the State of Oregon, listing the wolf on one side and not on the other, our State managers are prevented from effectively managing the population within our States. As I mentioned, wolves do not know borders.

Mr. Speaker, States are equipped to be more responsive and accountable to the needs of local communities than Federal agencies are, and they deserve the flexibility to manage the growing gray wolf populations. We should celebrate the return of the iconic species like the gray wolf. But meanwhile, States must be empowered to manage populations to ensure the healthiest balance between humans, wildlife, and the ecosystem.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and its underlying legislation, again, H.R. 6784, the Manage our Wolves Act.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 1142 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 6666, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 187, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—201

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Calvert
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Allen	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Bost	Chabot
Arrington	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Bacon	Brooks (AL)	Cloud
Balderson	Buchanan	Coffman
Banks (IN)	Buck	Cole
Barletta	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Barr	Budd	Comer
Bergman	Burgess	Conaway
Bilirakis	Byrne	Cook



Costa Johnson, Sam  
Costello (PA) Joyce (OH)  
Cramer Kelly (MS)  
Crawford Kelly (PA)  
Culbertson King (IA)  
Curbelo (FL) King (NY)  
Curtis Kinzinger  
Davidson Knight  
Davis, Rodney Kustoff (TN)  
Diaz-Balart LaHood  
Donovan LaMalfa  
Duffy Lamborn  
Duncan (SC) Lance  
Dunn Latta  
Emmer Lesko  
Eshoo Lewis (MN)  
Estes (KS) LoBiondo  
Faso Long  
Ferguson Loudermilk  
Fleischmann Love  
Flores Lucas  
Fortenberry Luetkemeyer  
Foss MacArthur  
Frelinghuysen Marchant  
Gaetz Marino  
Gallagher Marshall  
Gianforte Mast  
Gibbs McCarthy  
Gonzalez (TX) McCaul  
Gosar McClintock  
Gowdy McHenry  
Granger McKinley  
Graves (GA) McSally  
Graves (LA) Mitchell  
Graves (MO) Moolenaar  
Green, Gene Mooney (WV)  
Grothman Mullin  
Guthrie Newhouse  
Handel Nunes  
Harper Olson  
Hartzler Palazzo  
Hensarling Palmer  
Hern Paulsen  
Herrera Beutler Pearce  
Hice, Jody B. Perry  
Higgins (LA) Peterson  
Hill Pittenger  
Holding Poe (TX)  
Hollingsworth Poliquin  
Hudson Ratcliffe  
Huizenga Reichert  
Hunter Renacci  
Hurd Rice (SC)  
Issa Roby  
Johnson (LA) Roe (TN)  
Johnson (OH) Rogers (AL)

## NAYS—187

Adams Cuellar  
Aguilar Cummings  
Amash Davis (CA)  
Barragán Davis, Danny  
Bass DeFazio  
Beatty DeGette  
Bera Delaney  
Biggs DeLauro  
Bishop (GA) DelBene  
Blum Demings  
Blumenauer DeSaulnier  
Blunt Rochester Deutch  
Bonamici Dingell  
Boyle, Brendan Doggett  
F. Doyle, Michael  
Brady (PA) F.  
Brat Duncan (TN)  
Brown (MD) Ellison  
Bustos Engel  
Butterfield Espaillat  
Capuano Evans  
Carbajal Foster  
Cárdenas Frankel (FL)  
Carson (IN) Fudge  
Cartwright Gabbard  
Castor (FL) Gallego  
Castro (TX) Garamendi  
Chu, Judy Gohmert  
Cicilline Gottheimer  
Clark (MA) Green, Al  
Clarke (NY) Griffith  
Clay Grijalva  
Cleaver Gutiérrez  
Clyburn Hanabusa  
Cohen Heck  
Connolly Higgins (NY)  
Cooper Himes  
Correa Hoyer  
Courtney Huffman  
Crist Jackson Lee  
Crowley Jayapal

Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Yong (IA)  
Zeldin

Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norman  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
  
Babin  
Barton  
Beyer  
Black  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)  
Collins (GA)  
Comstock  
Denham  
DesJarlais  
Esty (CT)  
Fitzpatrick  
Garrett  
Gomez  
Goodlatte

## NOT VOTING—42

Harris  
Hastings  
Hultgren  
Jenkins (KS)  
Johnson (GA)  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Larson (CT)  
Lynch  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Messer  
Noem  
Norcross

Sires  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velazquez  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Yarmuth

□ 1707

Messrs. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, KRISHNAMOORTHY, LOEBSACK, MEADOWS, Ms. ADAMS, Messrs. BUTTERFIELD and GOHMERT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Capitol when the first vote series was called on November 14, 2018.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 418.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 418.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not make votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 418.

Stated against:

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 418.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 418.

# AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO GRANT STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS EASEMENTS AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER FEDERAL LAND WITHIN GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 6666) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to States and local governments easements and rights-of-way over Federal land within Gateway National Recreation Area for construction, operation, and maintenance of projects for control and prevention of flooding and shoreline erosion.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5276

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 5276.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1715

## HONORING WAR HERO WALTER “BERT” MINTUS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of western Pennsylvania native and war hero, Petty Officer Third Class Walter “Bert” Mintus.

Hailing from Portage, Pennsylvania, in 1942, Bert enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served as a radioman for Torpedo Squadron Fifty-One during World War II. This was the same torpedo squadron in which our 41st President, George H.W. Bush, served during the war.

On July 27, 1944, during a mission over the Pacific, his aircraft came under enemy fire from the Japanese and was shot down. Afterward, Bert and his brothers in arms on the plane were listed as missing in action and later presumed dead.

For nearly 74 years, the Mintus family was unsure of the fate that befell their beloved family member. That changed this year. Thanks to the diligent efforts of the U.S. Navy, this past June, Bert's remains were identified; and last Thursday, Bert's family finally welcomed their war hero home.

May God grant this son of western Pennsylvania eternal rest.

## HONORING ALBERTA DANIELS

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1