

board of directors at the Keystone Research Center, the Pennsylvania Budget and Policy Center, and the Council Rock Education Foundation. She also served as president of the Churchville Elementary Home and School Association.

For Dolores, it always came down to improving the lives of our community's children and their families. She firmly believed that every child, regardless of the circumstances of their birth, deserves the best education in the world.

A paralegal by trade, Dolores is survived by her husband, Jack Jr.; her children, Jack III and Kristin; and her grandchildren, Dylan, Reese, Paige, and Logan. May they take comfort in knowing Dolores' life work will carry on in our students' lives for generations. Dolores McCracken is our children's hero.

□ 0915

MANAGE OUR WOLVES ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1142, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Pursuant to House Resolution 1142, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6784

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Manage our Wolves Act".

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF FEDERAL PROTECTIONS FOR GRAY WOLVES IN WYOMING AND WESTERN GREAT LAKES.

(a) GRAY WOLVES IN WYOMING.—The final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530), that was reinstated on March 3, 2017, by the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (No. 14–5300) and further republished on May 1, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 20284), that reinstates the removal of Federal protections for the gray wolf in Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and this subsection, shall not be subject to judicial review.

(b) GRAY WOLVES IN WESTERN GREAT LAKES.—Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance (including this subsection) shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. 3. REMOVAL OF FEDERAL PROTECTIONS FOR GRAY WOLVES RANGE-WIDE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of fiscal year 2019, and except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior shall issue a rule to remove the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in each of the 48 contiguous States of the United States and the District of Columbia from the List of Endangered and

Threatened Wildlife in section 17.11 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule.

(b) LIMITATION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Such issuance (including this section)—

(1) shall not be subject to judicial review; and

(2) shall not affect the inclusion of the subspecies classified as the Mexican gray wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*) of the species gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in such list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debated for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill would accomplish what multiple administrations have been attempting to do for over a decade by delisting a species the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has deemed recovered under the Endangered Species Act. It also empowers the States to take a larger role in managing the species population.

The gray wolf has been protected in its original habitat in the western Great Lakes region under the Endangered Species Act since 1974. Beginning in 1994, the Federal Government began introducing species to the Western U.S. by relocating wolves from Canada and releasing them in Western States.

The reintroduced wolf population in the West expanded more quickly than many had anticipated, and as a result, Western States began to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service to better manage the species. This successful State and Federal cooperation led to the Fish and Wildlife Service's first attempt to delist the species under the Endangered Species Act in 2009. Litigation activists struck back, challenging the agency's delisting decision and halting further agency action at that time.

In 2014, the Fish and Wildlife Service, after noting an even greater increase in species population, attempted to once again delist the gray wolf. Just as before, litigants immediately challenged the agency's decision. That same year, gray wolves in Wyoming and the western Great Lakes region were relisted by court order, citing inadequate State management plans. This 2014 order was appealed, and in March of last year, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed

the relisting decision for the gray wolf, but in Wyoming only.

This underscores the extent to which the Fish and Wildlife Service has been hamstrung in implementing the objectives of the Endangered Species Act. Rather than spending its limited resources protecting vulnerable species, litigation activists have forced the agency to continuously defend every action.

In this case, despite scientific evidence collected under multiple administrations from both sides of the aisle showing that the gray wolf populations have recovered and thrived, the agency remains bogged down in costly, never-ending litigation. We should be celebrating this ESA victory instead of moving on to the next challenge.

This bill would prevent the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from wasting further resources in responding to environmental lawfare by affirming its previous rules to delist the gray wolf and shielding these rules from further review.

Finally, the bill seeks to empower the States to manage their individual gray wolf populations by directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a rule to delist the gray wolf in each of the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia. To ensure that States are provided certainty when developing State management plans, this bill would also exempt the delisting system from judicial review.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the commonsense bill that we have here, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bill today.

In a world full of lions and tigers entertaining the masses, have you ever seen a wolf in the circus? If you love your dog, thank a wolf.

There is a line of poetry that says: "A wolf eats sheep but now and then; Ten thousands are devour'd by men."

Wolves are historic and vital keystone predators that have been hunted to near extinction in the contiguous United States. After being formerly designated as endangered and protected under the Endangered Species Act, wolf populations began to rise. However, they still inhabit just a fraction of their historic range, and continued protection under the Endangered Species Act is necessary. Instead, H.R. 6784 strips the protections that have allowed the species to begin to recover.

Prior to widespread human settlement, hundreds of thousands of gray wolves roamed North America. They could be found from the Pacific Coast to the Atlantic Coast. Today, sadly, the farthest east they can be found is in Michigan.

Some of my colleagues might know that I would love to see the gray wolves in Virginia some day, but for now, it is important that we continue to protect the fewer than 6,000 that we have left in the lower 48.

How did we get to only 6,000? As the human population grew in the 19th and 20th centuries, gray wolves were poisoned, trapped, shot, gassed—every possible way to kill them—and their population decline was exacerbated by habitat destruction. Removing Federal protection opens the doors to further baiting, hunting, and trapping of wolves.

The war on wolves is based, in part, on a myth that wolves are dangerous to humans and livestock. The reality, of course, is that humans are far more dangerous to wolves than wolves are to livestock. Wolves cause less than 1 percent of all livestock losses in the United States, which is a minor threat compared to health issues, weather, and even other predators. In fact, domestic dogs cause more cattle losses than wolves do. But no one is talking about trapping or poisoning dogs.

Ironically, researchers at Washington State University have found that killing wolves leads to an increase in livestock losses caused by wolves. Wolves generally avoid people. There are only two known deaths from wolves in the entire contiguous United States in the 21st century. Far more Americans are killed by bees, dogs, or deer-car collisions than by wolves.

It has also been proven that State agencies cannot successfully manage these species. We have to look at what happened when they were delisted in Idaho and Montana in 2011. In just those two States, hostile State management practices have caused more than 3,200 wolves to be killed through hunting and trapping. That is half the known wolves in the lower 48.

Furthermore, we know that targeting wolves is not only cruel and detrimental to the species itself, but it is also detrimental to the other species and to the ecosystems in which it belongs.

Many of us have seen the video, the documentary on what has happened to Yellowstone since the reintroduction of wolves. Before, when wolves were eliminated, the explosion of other populations caused defoliation, erosion, and an unbalanced ecosystem in the park.

When wolves were reintroduced in 1995, everything changed. They were the keystone predator, the linchpin, that held together this delicate balance. When the deer and elk populations were managed, vegetation regenerated, which brought back species such as birds, beavers, mice, and bears. Riverbanks stabilized as plant life thrived and erosion decreased, and the whole landscape was transformed.

Delisting decisions are best kept in the hands of scientists, and we can't allow any delisting decisions to happen because of politics, particularly not to a species so historic, majestic, integral, and charismatic to the ecosystem in which it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the sponsor of the bill, who actually lives in an area where the wolves live.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his support in coming down and managing our time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is bipartisan in a time where I don't think we see a lot of bipartisanship. I think the reason you see Democrats and Republicans coming together and, actually, the House and the Senate coming together on this bill is because, if you live in the northern part of the United States in the Great Lakes and West, you understand that the wolves are a huge problem. That is why you have seen Democratic Senators from this region, Democratic Congressmen from this region, and Republicans standing together to say: Hey, listen, we have to manage these wolves.

If you live in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., it is not a problem. If you live in Madison, Wisconsin, it is not really a problem. You can make the argument that the pretty little puppy of the wolf, it is so pretty and beautiful and we have to protect it. Well, we did protect it. We put it on the endangered species list.

Like a lot of government programs, this one worked. We have protected them and allowed them to recover. We have three times as many gray wolves as was projected to be necessary to take them off the endangered species list.

We are coming to a hunting season in Wisconsin right now, so a lot of Wisconsinites put on their blaze orange and get their guns, and they go out to the woods and hunt deer.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a picture of Barack Obama in blaze orange and with his rifle going out to hunt deer. He is not a great outdoorsman, I don't think, but Barack Obama's administration was the one that first took the gray wolf off the endangered species list. And Donald Trump, too, agrees. Donald Trump and Barack Obama agreeing on an issue? They do on gray wolves.

You can say: I love the gray wolf. Protect it.

Does anybody like Bambi? Does anyone like Little Bear? Does anyone like your little pet—dogs? cats? cattle?

In our communities, here is a picture of one of our gray wolves. It is hard to tell on this picture, but that is a bear, and the bear is dead, by the way, because the wolf killed it.

Here is a picture from one of my farmers that shows one of his cattle that was attacked by a gray wolf. So what we are saying here is why can't we come together, acknowledge the success of a program, that the gray wolf has recovered, and then acknowledge that we should allow our States then to manage the gray wolf?

Some States might say: I want to allow the population to continue to

grow. Other States might say: We want to manage it. So if you live in California, you might say: In California, we have a small population. We are going to let that little population thrive and grow. But if you live in Wisconsin, especially northern Wisconsin, you might say: It is necessary for us to actually manage this population because it is good for the environment; it is good for the wolves; it is good for the cattle. It is actually really good for our deer population.

So I think this just makes common sense.

And, by the way, some have come out and said—as I talked about on the floor, I am kind of a PETA guy. I want to protect animals. Well, protecting animals is allowing our States to successfully manage the wolf population, because if you do, you not only protect the wolf, but you protect the deer; you protect the cattle, the dogs, and the bear. Everyone gets protected when you have a balance to the ecosystem.

We are out of balance right now, and, frankly, I believe that our States are far more in tune in understanding the ecosystem of their State than bureaucrats in Washington. So I would far rather empower Wisconsin; and my good friend, COLLIN PETERSON from Minnesota, let Minnesota manage those populations because they understand the ecosystem better.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to join Barack Obama and join Donald Trump and join a few Members of Congress from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Washington—and Senators as well—to allow us to successfully manage the gray wolf population which allows for a healthier ecosystem.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), my colleague.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill for a number of reasons, but I would specifically like to address how the bill undermines science.

Congress enacted the ESA to conserve and protect endangered and threatened species and their habitats in the U.S. and abroad. Congress also recognized that scientists, not Members of Congress—even me, ones like me with political science degrees—scientists have the necessary expertise to make decisions about species' protection. So the ESA requires that the Fish and Wildlife Service make the decisions regarding species listing and delisting. The law entrusts the Service's scientists to determine what is best for imperiled species, such as the gray wolf, using the best available science.

The ESA is credited as being one of the most science-based laws on the books, but this bill completely eliminates scientists from the decision-making process. It mandates that all gray wolves be removed from the ESA in the lower 48. In doing so, it short-circuits the law's science-based process

that determines when species have recovered and when protections are appropriately removed.

□ 0930

Despite years of Republican efforts to ignore the science behind the ESA, we know it has been a huge success. Ninety-nine percent of listed species have continued to survive, and 90 percent are on schedule to meet their recovery goals. So we should be working to make the gray wolf another one of those ESA success stories, not eliminating the protections that have helped put it on a path to recovery.

When the gray wolf was listed in the early 1970s, there were only a few hundred left in the wild. Since then, scientists have shown that the reintroduction of gray wolves in the Northern Rockies has been a huge ecological and economic success. I was able to see gray wolves in Yellowstone with Mr. BEYER and Mr. DEFAZIO earlier this year and to see the ecosystem that has rebounded since their reintroduction.

We are on the right track, but science shows that ESA protection is still needed. Currently, these wolves occupy only 5 percent of their historic range and only 36 percent of their suitable habitat. So while it is encouraging that the wolves are recovering and even coming into California for the first time in 90 years, a handful of these animals hardly shows that it is time for them to be delisted.

Instead of enacting a new law to eliminate protections, we ought to be working with landowners, local and State agencies, and others to prevent conflicts so that we and wolves can both thrive.

I would like to point out that if American citizens believe an agency does not follow the letter of the law, under the ESA, they have the right to hold the government accountable in court. It is part of the system of checks and balances that must be protected.

Politically driven, species-specific legislation like this sets a dangerous precedent for delisting. It opens the door to future partisan attacks on vulnerable species. Legislative delisting measures like this one undermine the scientific process fundamental to the success of the Endangered Species Act. Scientists, not Congress, should make these decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that the Endangered Species Act delisting a species is based on science, and the science has proven that this species is recovered. Twice under the previous administration, Fish and Wildlife tried to delist the species based on the science.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), who is also a cosponsor of the bill and from wolf country.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. I have to say, in my 28 years in

this body, I have never seen so much nonsense, misinformation, and propaganda put out on a bill as is being put out on this one. We followed the Endangered Species Act. We did what was said. The scientists said that we have recovered, and they delisted the wolves. These were scientists who did it; it wasn't any politician.

The politics on this, you had a group out there, these extreme environmentalists and others who have captured our party, that went to a judge in Washington, D.C., who has no idea what is going on at all, and convinced that judge that the wolves had not recovered because they had not been reestablished all the way to Des Moines, Iowa.

Do you want some wolves in Des Moines, Iowa? I don't think so. There were never any wolves in Des Moines, Iowa, in the first place.

So we followed the law. The Fish and Wildlife Service is on our side. They delisted these wolves. The DNR in Minnesota was managing the wolves and doing a good job before the court intervened politically.

I don't agree with the DNR. I have very seldom got along with the DNR in Minnesota. This is one time where they were doing the right thing. They did a good job, and the court stopped them.

It was politics; it wasn't science. So this nonsense that somehow or another that we are politically doing this is not true.

We have more wolves in my district than any other district in the United States. We have twice as many wolves as was required to get the wolves delisted. But that wasn't good enough.

So I say to all you folks who think this is such a great idea: We have a lot of extra wolves. We will send them to your district. We will let them eat some of your fancy little dogs and see how long that will go before your constituents demand that you do something about it.

My neighbor has had four of his cattle killed in the last 2 years. They killed his German shepherd dog and ripped it apart.

Are you telling me that this is not a problem?

When we had the population under control, we didn't have these kinds of problems. So this idea that somehow or another you are on the righteous side of science and all that stuff is complete nonsense. I will have the gentleman come up to my district, and he can see what is going on.

So we followed the law. We have the Federal agencies that are responsible for this that are on our side. It wasn't us who screwed this up; it was that court in D.C., and that judge has no clue about what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I tell Members to support this bill.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a few wolves in my district, not enough.

I don't know that I will take Mr. PETERSON's wolves, but we are breeding our own.

OR-7 made an incredible journey from way up in northeastern Oregon all the way down to the California border. He went down to California looking for a mate. He finally found one, and those were his first progeny.

Guess what? We are not having catastrophic predation on cattle in southern Oregon. We could accommodate more wolves.

Now, there are reasons why cattle die. My colleague from Oregon might show up, and he has a picture—it is kind of ugly—of a calf that was killed by wolves. It was sad that that calf didn't get to grow up and go to the slaughterhouse.

Here are the real facts. Seventy-four percent of loss is due to health issues; that is, good husbandry. Eight percent almost, 7.8, is due to weather; 2.7 is due to coyotes, cougars, bear, and dogs—predators. Oh, here we are. Look, that is the problem. Wait a minute. We have new numbers, 0.2 percent—0.2 percent—is due to wolf predation.

Now, I doubt that my colleagues on the other side have gone to Yellowstone to see the phenomenal recovery of the ecosystems in Yellowstone. We will hear that, oh, it is bad for hunters, elk. Well, actually, the elk population is doing very well, but they don't browse all the way down into the streams anymore. So now fish have come back, and other species have come back, because the elk are worried about the wolves, so they stick to the forested areas where they should be. So having apex predators is incredibly important to a balanced environment.

To say that we have to go out and slaughter those—Fish and Wildlife or Animal Damage Control, whatever the heck we call those jerks these days. The Federal Government has been subsidizing for years the indiscriminate slaughter of predator species, ostensibly to help out the ranchers.

Now, when I was a county commissioner, we were kind of broke, and we went through a list of everything we were doing. I said, what are we doing, giving this money there? They said that is our match to the Federal Government to come and kill coyotes. I said, why? What is that about? They said, oh, sheep predation, horrible, horrible.

We were broke. We cut out that. We said, no, we don't want these people here anymore. We are not going to subsidize it.

Guess what happened? Nothing. We did not have horrible sheep predation in my county.

So a lot of this is based on some kind of gut-level, historic fear or hatred of predators that has been passed down from generation to generation.

We can have a healthy wolf population, and you can still do good husbandry with cattle.

So they want to delist the wolf in all the lower 48. We have maybe 8, 12, 10—

we don't even know—in my district, which is historic habitat. In other parts of the State that have been previously occupied, there are no wolves. A couple of our wolves have wandered down to California, the first ones there since we were on this campaign to eliminate them all.

The other thing is science. When you kill the apex predators, then the coyotes depredate on the cattle. Then you have overpopulation of elk, and they browse riparian. A balanced environment is good for everybody.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, these people want to unbalance it and delist the entire lower 48. They want to defy good science. And, oh, by the way, what they are doing is so indefensible, but, well, we can't go to court because, actually, we are not following the law.

So this bill does a number of things that are really short-term bad.

By the way, it is going nowhere in the Senate. We are hearing messaging today that we could be doing a farm bill, and we could be doing affordable college education. There are a lot of things we could do—a budget for the United States Government. But, no, we are here on a talking point for a few idiots.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Oregon is so passionate about wolves, and this bill would be fantastic for him and his State.

It would allow their State natural resources folks to manage their wolves. They could release some in Portland. They could let those wolf populations get as large as they want to get. But the scientists at U.S. Fish and Wildlife have said that the species is recovered, and we are talking about letting other States have the opportunity to manage those wolf populations in their States.

I wish we were doing a farm bill. I wish the Senate would do a farm bill, because we have already done one out of here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, in my home in eastern Washington, we have been living the real impact of large wolf populations for many years now.

We see the impact on safety. We see the economic impact it is having on our ranchers. Each year, we are losing hundreds of livestock to wolves and costing our economy millions of dollars.

The gray wolf is recovered, and it is time for it to be removed from the Endangered Species Act. The Endangered Species Act has listed many species.

This is not about a hatred or a fear of predators. This is about actually recognizing that the Endangered Species Act

has done its job, and it is time for the wolf to be delisted.

In the fall of 2013, the Obama administration announced that the gray wolf was recovered. President Obama's Fish and Wildlife Director Dan Ashe has stated: The gray wolf "is no longer endangered or threatened with extinction. . . . As we propose to remove ESA protections, States like Washington and Oregon are managing expanding populations under protective State laws."

Unfortunately, the gray wolf was not delisted. In eastern Washington, and specifically in northeastern Washington, predation on calves has become common. I regularly hear from people who are seeing wolves around their property and from people who cannot defend themselves without it being a felony.

Eastern Washington knows better how to manage our land and wildlife than someone sitting here in a cubicle in Washington, D.C. What we are proposing is that these management practices would be returned to the State level, that we would allow the people who are closest to the land and to the practices to be able to take action that would benefit endangered and native animals while protecting farmers, ranchers, and our way of life.

I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill because it is important. It is important to our way of life. It is important to the people in eastern Washington. It is important to our economy.

I thank Congressman DUFFY from Wisconsin for his work and leadership on this issue that impacts many communities across the country.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to H.R. 6784, the Manage our Wolves Act.

Despite the claims made by our colleagues across the aisle, gray wolves play a critical role in keeping ecosystems healthy and balanced, including across Michigan and the Great Lakes region.

At one time, gray wolves roamed in the hundreds of thousands. Today, there are fewer than 6,000 gray wolves in existence. Just this week, the National Park Service announced that a gray wolf died after being relocated from Minnesota to Michigan's Isle Royale National Park.

The threat to gray wolves is still real, and they must be protected. The bill before us would remove all protections for gray wolves under the Endangered Species Act, including reissuing a 2011 rule by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that delisted the gray wolf in the western Great Lakes.

H.R. 6784 also seriously undermines scientific integrity, which is one of the foundations of the Endangered Species Act. It would remove scientists from the decision-making process to delist gray wolves. Scientists, not Congress,

should be making listing or delisting decisions.

□ 0945

As a keystone species, these iconic animals are vital to the structure of the ecological communities in which we live. Two decades ago, the lush landscape of Yellowstone National Park was not as we see it today. Instead, it was riddled with defoliation, erosion, and an unbalanced ecosystem.

Due to the absence of predators, deer and elk populations were out of control. Despite efforts to manage them, they overgrazed the park's vegetation. That all changed when gray wolves were reintroduced into the park in 1995.

As a top predator in the food chain, wolves hold together that delicate balance of the ecosystem. Once wolves were brought back to the park, the natural balance of the ecosystem was restored. The regenerated forests stabilized the riverbanks, leading to less erosion and more suitable wildlife habitat. And not to mention, wolves reduce the coyote population by as much as 50 percent. The whole landscape was dramatically transformed with the reintroduction of just a few gray wolves, and their presence can similarly be felt across the Great Lakes region.

Finally, gray wolves not only benefit the ecosystem, but they provide significant economic benefits as well. Just 10 years after reintroduction, wolf-related tourism generated more than \$35 million for communities in Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen what the absence of gray wolves can do to the ecosystem. We have seen how wildlife and plant populations suffer, from our national parks to the Great Lakes, without a proper predator-prey balance.

Yes, good progress has been made to revive the gray wolf population, but there is more work to do. H.R. 6784 would halt and potentially reverse the progress that has been made. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will emphasize something I think that has been said before. You always try to think of something new.

You can't help but notice that the number of people who do not want the gray wolf delisted live in areas that don't have gray wolves. The State of Wisconsin is maybe typical in this. They introduced gray wolves to northern Wisconsin. When there was controversy about it, they said, Well, that is okay. These are northern areas where very few people live. Of course, even then I had a problem with it because people did live up there.

I don't think the people near where this judge lived would want the gray wolves wandering around the Virginia and Maryland suburbs. They would not want the concern, walking around at night with the wolves, even though

they don't normally attack humans. They would not want the concern of the wolves out there if they have dogs or other pets around. If they had cattle, they wouldn't want that concern.

Wisconsin being very typical, I think the gray wolves that began in the northern part of the State are now all the way down to areas like Columbia County or Sheboygan County in the southern part of the State. And they will, unless somebody does something about it, continue to grow, continue to go further south, and the herds will continue to grow.

I would ask people who are going to vote against this: Think how you would feel if you have a significant number of gray wolves wandering around your subdivision—or even one gray wolf wandering around your subdivision—and then have more respect for the Congressmen who are living with these gray wolves.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about letting scientists make the decision, not letting others make the decision. But right now, courts are making the decision on the delisting of this wolf.

We have heard testimony that, even though it is a bipartisan bill, even though it was people in the previous administration that first suggested delisting the wolf, we have heard testimony that if you support delisting the wolf, you must be an idiot.

I don't think supporting this legislation means you are an idiot or you are trying to message something. I think it means that we want to see science implemented. I think it means that we want to let the scientists do their jobs.

Mention has been made about Yellowstone National Park. I was actually in Yellowstone National Park this last summer and talked to scientists out there about the big fire in the 1980s.

What many of us know about fire is that it is a natural occurring phenomena, and it mimicked a huge clear-cut in Yellowstone National Park. After the fire and all this vegetation started growing back, we saw a huge increase in elk and deer herds, and the wolf population increased right along with that.

As a matter of fact, the scientists at the park told me that the greatest numbers of elk that they have had happened within about 10 years after the big fire out there. The greatest population of wolves that they had happened after that. Now that the forest is growing back, that ecosystem, that forest will burn again—it burns about every 100 years—but the science is being applied here.

We just want to let States make the decisions on how to manage these wolves that the scientists have said are recovered and need to be delisted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be man-

aged by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this bill sets several incredibly damaging precedents, fundamentally weakening the protections of our Nation's threatened and endangered species.

The Endangered Species Act is one of the most effective and important conservation laws ever passed by Congress. The success is due, in large part, to a careful scrutiny of scientific evidence and the critical analysis of all factors when making decisions on the status of a species.

The Manage Our Wolves Act would remove protections under the ESA for one of the Nation's iconic wildlife species, without an opportunity for public participation in the rulemaking process for delisting. Even more troubling, this bill would explicitly ban any judicial review of the delisting of gray wolves in both the Great Lakes and nationwide.

No judicial oversight will be allowed for the removal of the science-based protections established under the Endangered Species Act. A species is only listed as endangered or threatened, or delisted upon its successful recovery, after a rigorous assessment of its extinction.

By eliminating judicial review of ESA delisting actions, this legislation removes the ability of the public and the scientific community to participate in the process. Access to a court of law is a cornerstone of American democracy and a fundamental part of our government.

The judicial branch is also where the American people can have their voices heard and they can have a say in our system of checks and balances. Stopping our independent Federal courts from reviewing the actions of Federal agencies, or of Congress, violates this access to justice principle. It is simply undemocratic. It undermines the necessary oversight of government decisions.

For years, the courts have served as an important forum for addressing disputes over ESA-related decisions. This legislation's attempt to remove judicial review from the ESA decision has no scientific or legal basis. It is simply a politically expedient move.

By prioritizing politics over conservation, this bill would cause irreparable damage to the integrity of the Endangered Species Act and sets a dangerous precedent of overriding the careful deliberations of the court.

Mr. Speaker, we should not support legislatively mandating decisions about vulnerable species. We should not circumvent the established process for making ESA determinations.

For this reason, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I was recently in Yellowstone in the last month and a half. And, yes, there was a fire in Yellowstone. I am from Minnesota. I know all about after fires go in, and the moose munch, as we call it, around the boundary waters in the Voyageurs National Park area comes back and you can start seeing moose. They start doing better. The same thing is true of the elk. I saw elk literally right out a car window. They are doing better.

But it is also very important to remember what Congressman DeFAZIO said about how, when the wolves are interactive and they are part of the regrowth and the rebirth of our forest system, the wolf, by being a predator, helps protect the stream banks and the rest from the elk and other animals from being on the stream banks and pressing them down. That has a big ripple effect on fish and other wildlife in the ecosystem, especially in Yellowstone.

So I appreciate the gentleman's remarks about Yellowstone, but it is just not one thing that is causing the elk to come back healthy. It is the wolf population, as well.

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

It is important, I think, to note, so you get a sense of what the gray wolves have done, that 1987 was when a plan was finalized to restore them to the Northern Rockies by transplanting the wolves from Canada into central Idaho, Yellowstone National Park.

In 1995 and 1996, 66 Canadian wolves were transplanted, with a goal of establishing 10 breeding pairs in each of three recovery zones in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming for three consecutive years.

Well, guess what, Mr. Speaker?

Those 66 Canadian wolves have done pretty well. In fact—and I think this is largely why the scientists with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with whom I have had many disagreements—but in this, these folks have come out and said: You know what? The U.S. population of 5,500 wolves have done real well since being transplanted from Canada. They are not the original U.S. wolves, but from Canada. They are bigger, more aggressive. But there are 3,800 just in the upper Great Lakes, 8,000 to 11,000 in Alaska, and now 60,000 in Canada. As their numbers increase, so do the massive problems.

I appreciated the anecdotal information about seeing more elk and moose. I would suggest, based on the rapidly escalating number of attacks, that you are going to see more and more elk and moose want to come hang around the cars so they don't get eaten by wolves. So you will have more and more tourists seeing elk and moose, but their populations are diminishing.

In fact, it is rather dramatic. Wolves eat 20 pounds of meat a day and elk comprise 92 percent of the wolf kills during the winter. Other prey include moose, caribou, deer, beaver, hares, and livestock.

In 1995, there were 19,000 elk in the northern Yellowstone herd. By 2008, there were 5,000. That is down from 19,000. The moose herd in the area also dropped from more than 1,000 to somewhere around 100 to 300. I am sure they will get to hanging out with tourists more and more just to keep from getting eaten.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague from Wisconsin, Representative SEAN DUFFY, and his bill, the Manage Our Wolves Act. This piece of legislation is critically important to my district and its farmers.

You see, farming is the lifeblood of northeast Wisconsin. Not only do our agricultural products support thousands of local jobs, they also feed millions of mouths across the world. This is why so many of my constituents are concerned by the threat of the gray wolf population to our farms. Already, the gray wolf's predatory behavior has cost Wisconsin farmers millions of dollars in damage.

This is why we must pass the Manage Our Wolves Act to delist the gray wolf from the Endangered Species Act and return control of population back to the States where it belongs. By doing so, farmers will finally be able to focus on actual farming, instead of having to spend extra time and money on keeping their livestock out of danger.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation. Our farmers are depending on it.

□ 1000

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), my colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Endangered Species Act is under unrelenting attacks by the Trump administration and House Republicans, it should come as no surprise that, after being out of session for more than 6 weeks, the first rules bill to go to the floor is one that continues those attacks on ESA, eliminates judicial review, takes the American people out of the public rulemaking process, and makes it easier to kill wolves.

However, one must ask my Republican colleagues: Seriously? Do we not have more pressing issues to address?

Children are still being separated from their families.

Wildfires are blazing across California.

There have been 311 mass shootings in our country this year.

We have more Federal troops on the southern border than we have in Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq, all patiently sitting around and looking for Poncho Villa's ghost to come around.

The UN released a climate change report finding that we are in a much more dire state than we thought. In fact, today would have been a great day to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which my Republican colleagues have allowed to expire twice on their watch, a bill with 240 bipartisan cosponsors. Instead, we are talking about killing wolves, a bill introduced in September with three cosponsors.

In this Congress, Republicans have introduced more than 100 bills, amendments, and policy riders to remove or block ESA protections for individual species or to weaken important provisions of a law that is not only hugely popular with the American people, but also conserves our biodiversity.

The bill before us today, H.R. 6784, is a piece of legislation we have seen time and time again to undermine wolf populations in the United States, but this would deliver an even more devastating blow to the continued recovery of gray wolves across the lower 48.

Congress should not be making decisions on which species to list or delist. What we need to be doing is properly funding the Fish and Wildlife Service to implement measures to strengthen ESA and protect species and their habitats from permanent extinction, given the fact that we are facing an ongoing extinction crisis.

The ESA has a near perfect record of saving imperiled species. Even in the face of massive population growth, haphazard development, and pressure on ocean and coastal resources, over 99 percent of the species receiving protection are still surviving today.

ESA works, and 90 percent of the American voters would agree with me.

However, despite its incredible public support and impressive track record, the Trump administration and House Republicans continue to attack this historic environmental law and the species that it protects. These attacks on one of the most successful and popular conservation statutes in the history of the world are old, they are tired, and they are not fooling anyone.

I can say with some confidence that these types of attacks on ESA will not be legitimized in the next Congress. Science, budget allocation, and protection and conservation will return as the prominent criteria for ESA policy—not just the resource extraction, industry's singular agenda.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I really have appreciated sitting on the floor and listening to this dialogue be-

cause I think that there are some lessons here about getting things right. My friend from Virginia, my friend from Oregon have dealt with the ecological benefits of having apex predators to be able to restore ecological balance.

I heard the notion of, “Well, how would you feel if you were reintroducing wolves in metropolitan areas?” and I just thought for a moment of listening in the past to people who are overrun with deer in Virginia suburbs, in Maryland suburbs. It is not just messing up their yards; it is killing people. We have several hundred people a year who are killed in collisions with deer. There are problems with chronic wasting disease that having an apex predator helps provide health benefits where you have healthier herds.

I have watched the dynamic in Oregon, and it is complex because there are people who are ranching interests, there are people who are involved with hunting, and they want to short-circuit it, even in a State as ecologically and animal friendly as Oregon. It is a struggle.

To take a step back, weakening the endangered species protections, substituting political judgments, I think, is inappropriate.

I would also note no small amount of irony that, in addition to the notion that we should be here reauthorizing the Land and Water and Conservation Fund, if we want to deal with animals in the closing hours of this session of Congress, why aren't we dealing with a half dozen bills that Republicans have refused to allow us to vote on that are overwhelmingly supported by the public and are supported by a majority of our Members?

It is, I think, doubly ironic that we are concluding where we have had Republican leadership forcing some of the worst animal welfare records. We lost two Republican incumbents with 50 years of service in Republican districts who had the worst animal records in Congress.

I fought really hard to have animal welfare be a bipartisan issue. Taking issues like this, forcing people to make false choices that are bad for animals, bad for the environment—frankly, they are bad politics.

I hope that we go through this charade, it goes nowhere, but deal with the underlying debate here about what we want in terms of ecological balance, animal protection, and rule of law. We will be better off if we do that; the species will be better off if we do that; and I think the politics will be cleaner and more productive.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing me to speak on this.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is a contention that gray wolves, though they have dramatically exploded from those 66 original wolves being introduced to thousands and thousands now, are not

a threat to people; but I would suggest to you that, not only have the liberals in the U.S. Government seen a need year after year to delist the gray wolves, but a college student named Kenton Carnegie's family members would suggest that, when Kenton was killed by gray wolves, the gray wolves were a threat to mankind; and Candice Berner, a teacher in Alaska who was killed while jogging, her surviving family members would suggest gray wolves are a threat to people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that time be managed by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6784 as this act will block vital protection for gray wolves across the entire Nation, protections that were implemented under the Endangered Species Act.

H.R. 6784 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a rule removing the gray wolf from the Endangered Species Act list, which would preclude judicial review of agency decisions on wolf delisting and deny citizens the right to hold the Government accountable for its actions.

There is no mystery about the negative impact that passing this legislation would have on the gray wolf, because we have already seen it. In 2011, Congress used an appropriations rider to delist wolves in Idaho and in Montana. And since 2011, over 2,500 wolves have been killed in these two States where the management practices included shooting wolves lured by bait, chasing wolves with packs of hounds, using steel-jawed legholds, and using wire snare traps.

Given these concerns, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. Endangered Species Act decisions must be made with caution. We should also be extremely bipartisan in these approaches. And if there is legitimate dispute over delisting, then delisting is premature and ill-advised. That is why I oppose this legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act was passed to increase protections for and provide for the recovery of vanishing wildlife.

Unfortunately, in recent years we have seen countless attacks on the ESA and science-based decisions, and this bill is no exception. This bill would hastily remove Endangered Species Act protections for all gray wolves in the lower 48 States without a rule-

making process or the opportunity for judicial review.

Although the population of gray wolves has started to recover, it is now only 5 percent of the number that existed historically. Scientists are just beginning to understand the role of gray wolves in the larger ecosystem, and listing and delisting decisions should be based on science, not politics.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many more important things we need to be doing today. Today, instead of undermining the Endangered Species Act, we should be reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund, passing the Violence Against Women Act, and the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arkansas has 8½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard today, our colleagues say that this bill is needed to mitigate human/livestock conflict, but that claim is just simply not compelling. Across the country, wolves account for only two-tenths of 1 percent of all cattle losses. Other predators, such as mountain lions, coyotes, and even stray dogs account for significantly more livestock kills.

My friend from Minnesota talked about his neighbor's German Shepherd being killed by a wolf. We have small dogs and cats killed in our densely urban area all the time by coyotes and by foxes, and no one is talking about hunting the coyotes or hunting the foxes. For example, out of the 3.9 million cattle deaths in 2015, coyotes and dogs combined killed more than 164,000 livestock, compared to the 10,000 killed by wolves. That is 16 times as many. Not to mention that 93 percent of all cattle losses are due to disease or other natural causes.

In the northern Rockies alone, which is where we have been talking about today mostly, wolf depredations account for less than 1 percent of all livestock losses: 256 sheep and 41 cattle over an 8-year period of time.

The numbers don't lie. The claims that wolves are responsible for a massive slaughter of livestock is simply a myth used to justify lethal control of these animals.

Instead of the shoot-first-ask-questions-later mentality, there are lots of great farmers promoting nonlethal methods that have been scientifically proven to mitigate human/wolf conflicts: livestock guardian dogs, fencing, and reducing attractants.

There are solutions to this problem that don't involve the unnecessary killing of one of the most iconic and

charismatic animals, not just in North America, but in human imagination.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we consider this bill and we talk about the science behind it, again, we are basing this legislation on science, on letting the scientists do their jobs. This bipartisan bill is exactly, exactly the type of legislation that will save the Endangered Species Act.

The ESA aspires to recover imperiled plant and animal species. The act was never meant to serve as a long-term management tool.

What my colleagues across the aisle should be celebrating is this ESA success story. Not just once, but multiple times, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined the gray wolf recovered and attempted to delist the species.

□ 1015

We know this wasn't a partisan decision because we saw these attempts span multiple administrations from both sides of the aisle. Our experts, our very own scientists, at Fish and Wildlife Service have expressed to us again and again that the gray wolf is recovered and ready to be delisted.

Unfortunately, instead of allowing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to focus its resources on other endangered species, litigation activists continue to force the agency to defend this scientifically-driven decision and delay the delisting.

We are nearly a decade past the agency's first attempt to delist the recovered gray wolf species. To continue to list a species our own experts have determined is recovered sends the message that the Endangered Species Act doesn't work.

I appreciate the bipartisan support this bill enjoys, and I hope more of my colleagues across the aisle will join us in helping strengthen the Endangered Species Act in the long run by supporting this legislation.

With that, I urge adoption of this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bipartisan legislation. The Endangered Species Act helps species recover, and let me tell you, it works. In 1980, there were 25 wolves in Wisconsin. Recently, that number grew to 232 wolf packs—roughly 900 wolves.

Now that the wolf population is recovered, states must be allowed to take over management. The rising wolf population means livestock and hunting dogs fall prey to attacks, and as long as federal protections remain in place, Wisconsinites cannot protect their property.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 6784 because, outside of dire circumstances, states are the most effective managers of wildlife and the policies affecting state residents. This legislation restores power to states, and I hope all my colleagues join me in voting for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1142, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6784 is postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3554. An act to extend the effective date for the sunset for collateral requirements for Small Business Administration disaster loans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 140) "An Act to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.", with an amendment.

STRENGTHENING COASTAL COMMUNITIES ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of November 13, 2018, and clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 5787) to amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act to give effect to more accurate maps of units of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System that were produced by digital mapping of such units, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 1, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

YEAS—375

Abraham	Barragán	Bonamici
Adams	Bass	Bost
Aderholt	Beatty	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Bera	F.
Allen	Bergman	Brady (PA)
Amash	Beyer	Brat
Amodei	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Arrington	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Babin	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Balderson	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Banks (IN)	Blum	Bucshon
Barletta	Blumenauer	Budd
Barr	Blunt Rochester	Burgess

Bustos	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Butterfield	Green, Al	McKinley
Byrne	Green, Gene	McMorris
Calvert	Griffith	Rodgers
Carbajal	Grijalva	McNerney
Cárdenas	Grothman	McSally
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Meadows
Carter (GA)	Hanabusa	Meeks
Carter (TX)	Handel	Meng
Cartwright	Harper	Mitchell
Castor (FL)	Harris	Moolenaar
Castro (TX)	Hartzer	Mooney (WV)
Chabot	Heck	Moore
Cheney	Hern	Morelle
Chu, Judy	Herrera Beutler	Moulton
Cicilline	Hice, Jody B.	Mullin
Clark (MA)	Higgins (LA)	Murphy (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Nadler
Clay	Hill	Napolitano
Cleaver	Himes	Neal
Cloud	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Clyburn	Hoyer	Norcross
Coffman	Hudson	Norman
Cohen	Huffman	O'Halleran
Cole	Huizenga	O'Rourke
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Olson
Collins (NY)	Hurd	Palazzo
Comer	Issa	Pallone
Conaway	Jackson Lee	Palmer
Connolly	Jayapal	Panetta
Cook	Jeffries	Pascarell
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Correa	Johnson (LA)	Payne
Costa	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Costello (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Courtney	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Cramer	Jordan	Perry
Crawford	Kaptur	Peterson
Crist	Katko	Pingree
Cuellar	Keating	Pittenger
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Poliquin
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Posey
Davidson	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Raskin
Davis, Rodney	Kildee	Reed
DeFazio	Kilmer	Reichert
DeGette	Kind	Rice (NY)
Delaney	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
DeLauro	Kinzinger	Richmond
DelBene	Knight	Roe (TN)
Demings	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (AL)
DeSaulnier	Kuster (NH)	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Rohrabacher
Deutch	LaHood	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rosen
Dingell	Lamb	Rothfus
Doggett	Lamborn	Rouzer
Donovan	Lance	Roybal-Allard
Doyle, Michael	Langevin	Royce (CA)
F.	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Duffy	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Russell
Dunn	Lawrence	Rutherford
Emmer	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Lee	Sánchez
Eshoo	Lesko	Sanford
Españat	Levin	Scalise
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Scanlon
Estry (CT)	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Evans	Lipinski	Schiff
Faso	LoBiondo	Schneider
Ferguson	Loebach	Schrader
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Long	Scott (VA)
Flores	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Fortenberry	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Foster	Lowe	Serrano
Fox	Lucas	Sessions
Frankel (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Sewell (AL)
Frelinghuysen	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
Fudge	M.	Sherman
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Shimkus
Gaetz	MacArthur	Simpson
Gallagher	Maloney,	Sinema
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Sires
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Smith (MO)
Garrett	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Gianforte	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Gibbs	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Gohmert	Mast	Smith (WA)
Gomez	Matsui	Smucker
Gonzalez (TX)	McCarthy	Soto
Goodlatte	McCauley	Speier
Gosar	McClintock	Stefanik
Granger	McCollum	Stewart
Graves (GA)	McEachin	Suozi
Graves (LA)	McGovern	Takano

Taylor	Veasey	Weber (TX)
Tenney	Vela	Webster (FL)
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Welch
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wenstrup
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Westerman
Thornberry	Walberg	Wilson (FL)
Tipton	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Titus	Walker	Wittman
Tonko	Walorski	Womack
Torres	Walters, Mimi	Woodall
Trott	Wasserman	Yoder
Turner	Schultz	Young (AK)
Valadao	Waters, Maxine	Young (IA)
Vargas	Watson Coleman	Zeldin

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—54

Barton	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas
Black	Jones	J.
Blackburn	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	King (NY)	Roskam
Brownley (CA)	Labrador	Ross
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Comstock	Love	Sarbanes
Crowley	Lynch	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Messer	Shuster
Denham	Noem	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	Nunes	Tsongas
Gottheimer	Peters	Upton
Gowdy	Poe (TX)	Walz
Gutierrez	Polis	Williams
Hastings	Ratcliffe	Yarmuth
Hensarling	Renacci	Yoho
Holding	Roby	
Hultgren	Rooney, Francis	

□ 1049

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. BLUMENAUER, ESPAILLAT, HUFFMAN, BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 419, I was unavoidably detained to cast my vote in time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MANAGE OUR WOLVES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of 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, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 196, noes 180, not voting 54, as follows: