

to join in commemorating June 20, 2019, as American Eagle Day and to celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as the national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress.

The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle has played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and culture of the United States. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating June 20, 2019, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain this request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill so the American people know where we stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 445 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3055.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1019

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the De-

partments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, with Mr. HECK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 19, 2019, amendment No. 58 printed in part B of House Report 116-119 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) had been disposed of.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chair, this is Maleah Davis. We mourn her loss in Houston, Texas. She was 4 years old.

My amendment provides funding to support and engage adult men and young persons to reduce and prevent domestic violence against children. In recent reports, 1,600 children died because of abuse or neglect.

This amendment will help ensure the safety of vulnerable children in at-risk households who are powerless to get the help and attention they need from our government.

To illustrate this, this is the case of Maleah Davis, a 4-year-old girl who lived in Houston. In the past, Texas Child Protective Services removed Maleah and her two brothers from their home over reports of abuse but returned them again in February. They took them away from their relatives and, along with a court judge, returned them to this family.

Maleah's mother dated her boyfriend for years, and they had a son. Maleah's mother had gone to a funeral out of town.

When the boyfriend initially reported that his girlfriend's daughter was missing, he told detectives that he had been attacked, but surveillance video shows him carrying a black bag out of the home.

The last time that Maleah was seen was going into that home.

The real question is whether or not the Child Protective Services is really doing its job, whether or not it is dealing with educating these families or intervening in these families to make sure a loving little girl like Maleah Davis does not lose her life.

In addition to this funding to intervene in men and boys' lives to prevent this kind of abuse and loss of life, and the tragedy of finding the remains of little Maleah in a plastic bag along the highway in Arkansas, I look forward to working with my colleagues on an overhaul of children's protective services throughout the Nation, because, in particular in Texas, 1,600 children die

of abuse and neglect, many of them in children's protective services.

I am delighted that my amendment passed.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Chairwoman LOWEY's En Bloc Amendment No. 2, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 19.

I wish to thank Chairman McGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman SERRANO and Ranking Member ADERHOLD for their hard work in bringing Division A, the Commerce-Justice-Science portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment, which is simple and straightforward and ensures that our government works to protect our children.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 19, reprograms \$2 million in the Office of Justice Programs grant funding to support programs to engage adult men and young persons to reduce and prevent domestic violence against children.

This amendment will help ensure the safety of vulnerable children in at-risk households, who are powerless to get the help and attention they need from our government.

To illustrate the need for this amendment, let me share with you the tragic case of Maleah Davis, a 4-year old little girl who lived in Houston.

In the past, Texas Child Protective Services removed Maleah and her two brothers from their home over reports of abuse, but returned them to the home in February.

Maleah's mother dated her boyfriend for years and they shared a toddler son together.

Maleah's mother had gone out of town when she left her daughter under her boyfriend's care.

When the boyfriend initially reported that his girlfriend's daughter was missing, he told detectives he had been attacked by unknown men a day earlier and that they kidnapped Maleah.

However, surveillance video outside of the home shows Maleah never left their apartment after she followed him in, and shows him carrying a laundry basket with a trash bag out of the building a day before he reported her missing.

Maleah's remains were later discovered in a bag along Interstate 30 in Arkansas.

Although the case has not been completed yet, there are valuable lessons that we can learn from Maleah's and similar cases.

There have been similar cases to Maleah where the caretaker initially reports a missing child but we later learn that the caretaker is actually the suspect and perpetrator of the crime.

Similar cases include 5-year old AJ Freund from Illinois, whose father confessed to hiding his body in the basement, and 7-week old Shaylie Madden from North Carolina, whose mother has been charged with first-degree attempted murder.

The nation has learned from Maleah and other similar stories that we must do everything in our power to protect at risk children.

Maleah Davis should be alive today.

Horrible cases such as this should not be happening in America; we need to make sure our checks and balances are keeping our children safe.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for supporting en bloc No. 2, which included two of my amendments.

The first amendment directs NASA to work toward the development of a low-enriched uranium space power reactor. NASA has been developing a low-enriched uranium propulsion system, but some of the funding for this has been used on other projects, including a power reactor using weapons-grade uranium.

The problem is that if all the spacefaring nations of the world start using large amounts of weapons-grade material in their space reactors, then it will be difficult to ensure that this material would not be diverted to weapons programs in space and on Earth.

If the U.S. develops a low-enriched uranium space power reactor design, it is likely that this type of reactor design will be adopted as a de facto standard by other spacefaring nations, making Earth and space a safer place.

The second amendment directs \$6.5 million of the space technology account, which is currently funded at \$1.29 billion, to be used by the NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts, or NIAC, program. That will put the total budget for NIAC at \$15.2 million.

The NIAC program nurtures visionary ideas that could transform future NASA missions with the creation of breakthroughs that could dramatically lower the cost of space travel while simultaneously engaging America's innovators and entrepreneurs as partners in the journey.

The nation that first demonstrates such technologies will own the future of space travel.

At \$15.2 million, NIAC is still less than a tenth of a percent of NASA's overall \$22 billion budget, but this is a small step in the right direction.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support of these amendments.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of the Census to use information or records received through data sharing agreements in contravention of existing law, including sections 9 and 214 of title 13, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman

from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would defend the integrity of the U.S. Census.

The U.S. Census is crucial to every community, and it is our duty as Members of Congress to ensure that every person is counted. Not only does the Census send a message that every person should be counted, but it determines how and where Federal dollars are spent.

Simply put, it is crucial for our local cities and counties.

The Census count helps us understand how to best provide healthcare, education, housing, and numerous other public services.

As the chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Innovation and Workforce Development, I have seen how the Census determines how we spend Federal dollars for programs like the Small Business Development Center Program and Community Development Block Grants.

It is clear that the purpose of the citizenship question, which we have already debated and will continue to debate, is not to ensure that resources go to the communities that need it most but rather to stoke fear and suppress the Census count.

In communities like mine, this would have a huge impact. It would undermine our ability to gather an accurate count. That doesn't just hurt people in our community. It strains public resources and poses risks to our community's public health and safety.

I am here to lift up the voices in my community and assure them that Congress will not replace good governance with fear.

While the administration announced that it would continue the data-sharing agreement with the Department of Homeland Security to provide quality statistics, my amendment reasserts that existing law prohibits the Census Bureau from sharing individualized Census data across agencies. Congress must stand firm in assuring the public that no disaggregated data may leave the Census.

Furthermore, this amendment raises awareness of the law that penalizes any disclosure of information by Census employees who share personally identifiable information with agencies like Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I thank Congressman CROW for yielding and for his great work on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, the Census aims to count each person living in the United States every 10 years. It is important that we get this count right because the information helps determine a vast array of decisions, from the number of congressional seats to the allocation of Federal dollars.

For example, according to the Brennan Center for Justice, my home State of Texas stands to gain three congressional seats. These gains will go a long way for Texans and help bring much-needed funds to every community in the State, but we must ensure an accurate count.

With the administration's push to include a citizenship question on the upcoming Census and scare Latino communities like mine into not participating, this amendment underscores the fact that no personally identifiable information can be shared.

This amendment will give all residents, regardless of their immigration status, the confidence they need to answer the survey questions freely and to know that their data will be kept safe and secure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

□ 1030

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment and actually thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor.

As I had said yesterday, I certainly understand the concerns and the potential misuse of Census data, but by law the Census Bureau cannot and it will not disclose anyone's response or share data from which an individual can be identified with ICE or any other agency.

Thankfully the law is already on the books. Census data sharing is a felony punishable by up to 5 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine. Census data is important, and it is confidential.

Fortunately, the Census Bureau is deploying expert communicators and trusted messengers all across the United States to work in each community to motivate each and every person to respond to the Census, and it would also help to spread the word that a person's response that they are not a citizen of the United States does not provide the government with really any reliable information about whether they are lawfully present in the U.S.

So, even if this information was sent to ICE, it would really have no use. It would be of no use to them. A successful 2020 Census will provide a full, accurate, secure account of every person living in the U.S. while gathering the data vital to both understanding our Nation's changing demographics and bolstering the enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

Therefore, I join my colleagues in opposing any funds that would be made available to violate the confidentiality laws governing our Census, and I thank the gentleman for raising this issue

and certainly support a “yes” vote on this important amendment.

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, just to be clear, we vehemently oppose the citizenship question because as the evidence has made it abundantly clear, the purpose of that question is to suppress the count and to stoke fears within our communities, which will have a huge detrimental impact to our ability to gain an accurate count and provide resources in an effective way and to govern throughout the country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The Commerce Department has not answered basic questions related to the purpose behind its sharing agreement with the Department of Homeland Security.

Although I am not suggesting the Census Bureau will use the information for something other than statistical purposes, I think it is important to remind the Department we are mindful of how individuals’ information will be handled.

Ensuring the public trust in the Census is vital to getting an accurate count, and this amendment helps in that goal.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, in closing, I just want to reiterate the need that we send a very strong message as Members of Congress that we have to enforce existing law.

We have to provide the confidence to people throughout the country that the Census will not be used to undermine the integrity of the process, that the citizenship question’s purpose is to stoke fears and to suppress the count, and that we will not allow those fears to overcome the need for good governance to gain an accurate count and make sure that the government is working effectively and we are providing resources to people throughout our communities.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, public service is a high calling, and we should do everything we can to encourage our best and our brightest, really all, to pursue it. For me, the opportunity to serve in Congress is a privilege and the honor of a lifetime, and I know my fellow Members feel the same.

Unfortunately, for too many young people, public service isn’t always a realistic option. Nowhere is that surer than our broken criminal justice system. There is no question that if we are going to fix the problems that trouble our criminal justice system, we need prosecutors and public defenders of the highest caliber.

Right now, students graduate law school with between \$84,000 and \$122,000 in debt, while jobs in prosecutor’s or defender’s offices pay just \$56- to \$58,000 a year. As a result, students who are eager to contribute their talents to work for justice to defend the rights of the vulnerable simply can’t afford to. Well, we can’t afford to lose them.

The John R. Justice Act was designed to fix this problem by providing student loan repayment of \$10,000 a year for law students who make a minimum 3-year commitment to public service. In theory, students can earn up to \$60,000 in total loan repayments, making public service a far more realistic option.

In reality, however, Congress has failed to properly fund the program. While the program is authorized up to \$25 million a year, actual appropriations have fallen dramatically short and now sit at just under \$2 million.

Here are the consequences: In my home State of Pennsylvania, the Commission on Crime and Delinquency was able to fund only 38 of the 167 applicants received since 2015. That is less than 25 percent. For those individuals who were fortunate enough to receive any funding at all, the grant amounts totaled only \$4,100.

That is better than nothing, but for most students it is not enough to help them pay down their debt and devote themselves to public service.

It is time to act. This amendment doubles the funds provided under the John R. Justice Act, thereby delivering an immediate, substantial impact. This will mean concrete help for many more students who are eager to work on behalf of the public and build a better, smarter, more compassionate criminal justice system.

It also sends a signal that we in Congress aren’t satisfied with mere rhetoric and that we will do what it takes to give every student a chance to serve their communities and their country.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I am very pleased to put this forward in hopes that we draw more talent not just in my home State but across this country to public service in prosecutor’s and public defender’s offices around the Nation.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the “Memorandum for Federal Prosecutors Along the Southwest Border, Zero-tolerance for Offenses Under 8 U.S.C. 1325(a)” issued by the Attorney General on April 6, 2018.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On April 6, 2018, then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions unveiled the zero-tolerance prosecution policy, a memo directing U.S. Attorneys along the southwest border to prosecute all improper entry cases impacting thousands of migrants since its implementation.

My amendment would end this policy and restore prosecutorial discretion at the Department of Justice. This amendment is necessary because zero-tolerance is the center of the administration’s cruel family separation policy.

Under zero-tolerance, when an asylum-seeking family crosses the border between a port of entry, parents are placed in DOJ custody while they await their prosecution date. The child is then deemed unaccompanied and placed in the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement. At least 3,000 families that we know of have been separated. Some children were literally ripped from their parents’ arms.

At the height of the family separation crisis last summer, the President signed an executive order entitled: “Affording Congress an Opportunity to Address Family Separation.” That was on June 20, 2018, exactly 1 year ago today. However, this executive order does not end zero-tolerance. Instead, the executive order favored family detention—possibly indefinitely—over release.

I have seen the consequences of family separation firsthand in my community. Before zero-tolerance was implemented, the administration used El Paso as a testing ground for these horrific family separations in the fall of 2017. During this pilot program, 281 families were separated. The American Association of Pediatrics tells us that separating children from their parents

is highly damaging and can cause long-term health consequences from toxic stress.

These children are suffering emotionally and physically as a result of this government. We must put an end to this cruelty and work on reuniting all of those who remain separated.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, a vote for this amendment is a vote to effectively decriminalize the action of crossing the border unlawfully.

The passage of this amendment would directly undermine the sovereignty of the United States, and furthermore, if passed, the amendment would immediately be seized upon by every criminal human smuggling organization and used as a selling point to convince migrants to come to the United States in an unlawful manner.

It would trigger a flood of illegal immigration unlike anything we have ever seen, which will cause most of the most vulnerable individuals to attempt to embark on a dangerous journey. Cartels and human smuggling organizations will profit. Our borders will be less secure. And the American people will pay the cost of open borders for years to come.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in very strong support of the gentleman’s amendment.

The zero-tolerance experiment has been a tragic mistake. It has swamped U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals, and district courts with low level nonviolent cases previously handled by DHS and, if necessary, immigration courts. It has also separated thousands of families and traumatized children and parents. Children may remain with parents in DHS custody, but they cannot follow them into jail, even for such misdemeanor charges.

DOJ should focus on criminal gangs, human trafficking, and smuggling, most of which passes through, not between, the ports of entry.

The zero-tolerance policy restricts seasoned prosecutors from pursuing serious crime and distorts priorities by requiring an unbalanced and inflexible approach. It is clearly not improving things at the border.

Mr. Chair, I urge the House to adopt this very important amendment.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers. I would just urge all of my colleagues to come to my community to see for themselves the impact of this horrific policy.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1045

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to utilize a right whale status and risk reduction decision support tool.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to offer my amendment to H.R. 3055.

Mr. Chair, it is frequently said that working men and women feel left out by their government’s decisionmaking process. Too often in Washington, those with the greatest financial means can get the closest to the political, governmental, and regulatory process and, therefore, be better able to influence it.

Just as bad is that, in this gridlock political machine, what little action that does take place often takes the path of least resistance.

So when a species of whale is at risk of extinction for a whole slew of complex reasons—whether it be the overfishing that took place more than a century ago, climate change and warming waters that wreak havoc upon a whale’s habitat, seismic air gun testing for oil and natural gas, deadly ship strikes by a large shipping industry, or the risk of entanglement in a lobsterman’s fishing gear—who, and to what degree, does Washington regulate each? And who has a seat at the table to ensure that the process behind such decisions is fair and equitable?

Do we believe that a small group of fishermen in Maine have as strong a place at the table as does the fossil fuel or shipping industry, or the governmental affairs director with a K Street office in Washington?

I don’t think so.

So NOAA, facing the threat of lawsuits, has rushed ahead using a decision support tool that was developed for the purpose of reducing ship strikes by the Navy and fed that tool with old data and hasty assumptions and have come forward to require Maine lobstermen to achieve a 60 percent risk reduction in their fishery.

What assumptions you might ask?

Maine’s own Department of Marine Resources argues the tool is flawed because areas with a lot of fishing gear but few whales are labeled “high risk,” and areas with a lot of whales and less fishing gear are considered “low risk.”

This scientific tool uses outdated habitat data from the mid-Atlantic, which is far away and different than the gulf of Maine. When attributing responsibility for injury or death of whale to fishing gear of an unknown origin, NOAA assumes an equal distribution between U.S. and Canadian gear, despite strong, recent scientific and empirical evidence to the contrary. And the data used do not accurately reflect the distribution shift of right whales since the year 2010.

Recent studies have established firm links between warming waters in the gulf of Maine and a 90 percent reduction of the plankton that right whales eat, calling into question whether the whales have stopped visiting the warming, plankton-depleted waters of eastern Maine entirely, which would greatly reduce the likelihood that any whale be entangled in Maine lobstermen’s gear.

It is reasonable to ask NOAA to allow its decision support tool to undergo a peer-review process before enforcing punitive regulations upon Maine fisherman. Maine’s Commissioner of the Department of Marine Resources has said that “peer-reviewed science is the cornerstone of the decisionmaking process.” Apparently, not in this case.

This amendment would require NOAA to use relevant data and an effective tool to ensure that its regulations target areas of high risk and yield the most effective conservation benefits possible to protect the right whale without unfairly burdening Maine lobstermen.

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

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit NOAA from utilizing a science-based stakeholder decision support tool to save the North Atlantic right whale from imminent extinction.

The decision support tool was developed based on the best-available scientific information and models about the population dynamics of the whales. Defunding it undermines the consensus-based conservation decision-making process under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and would set a dangerous precedent for implementation of that law. It would also have lasting impacts for other species, fisheries, and industries.

Again, this whale, the North Atlantic right whale, is critically endangered. There are less than 420 left. That is fewer than we have Members of this House of Representatives.

With this amendment, while it may be well-intended to protect Maine lobstermen, it could have broadly undermining effects on right whale conservation and on NOAA's responsibilities under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

I fully understand my colleague's concerns and efforts to support constituencies. I, too, represent a coastal district with commercial fishermen; so does our colleague, SETH MOULTON in Massachusetts. And we are committed to working together to find a solution to the crisis facing the North Atlantic right whale, including holding a hearing on Mr. MOULTON's bill, the bipartisan SAVE Right Whales Act, in the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee that I chair.

I am also fully supportive of his amendment to increase funding for right whale conservation. We should be devoting more resources to develop innovative solutions for the recovery of right whales to meet both fisheries and conservation goals, not choosing one goal over the other which, unfortunately, this amendment does.

I would also point out that the Committee on Natural Resources worked with Mr. GOLDEN on several other possible amendments. We continue to stand ready to work on other ways and other solutions, but unfortunately, this amendment is not it.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that the person who runs this program for NOAA has actually recently said that they intend to move forward with regulations, then do a peer review, and then, perhaps, come back with a different conclusion.

I think that they have got this backwards. They should be doing it the other way around, and that is what is at the heart of this amendment. I would urge support at this time for the amendment, as well as for the Moulton amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), and I thank her for joining me on this amendment and for her leadership on behalf of Maine fisheries.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for raising concerns that I think many of us have. But in this case, I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have long fought to protect the health of our oceans and the sea life that inhabit them. That is why I have opposed the Trump administration's plan to drill in the gulf of Maine since day one. And I am proud that this Chamber recently passed our ocean acidification bill.

Along with my colleague from Maine's Second District, we represent 90 percent of all the lobster landings in the United States. Lobster is an iconic symbol of our State, especially this

time of year when Mainers and visitors from across the country enjoy our coastline and our food.

I am proud of our very well-managed and highly restrictive lobster fishery of responsible operators. We need to work together on a new peer-reviewed tool to address this problem.

Our State also is the home of a vibrant conservation movement that supports marine conservation and protecting the right whale. We have been successful over the past several years in creating tools with NOAA, our lobster industry, and conservationists. Indeed, the State of Maine has been actively involved in right whale conservation and worked with NOAA in the past to ensure that our State is doing all we can to keep whales safe in our very active fisheries.

Unfortunately, in April, NOAA's Large Whale Take Reduction Team announced a plan to reduce right whale deaths that forced lobstermen to reduce their vertical lines by 50 percent. This risk-reduction tool, as my colleague mentioned, has not gone through a peer-review process despite significant concerns from the stakeholders that should be addressed. It does not account for many of the issues specific to the gulf of Maine.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to stand for a fair process, and I support this amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I recognize what my friends from Maine are attempting to do to help an important industry in their State, but I must oppose them in favor of supporting the critically endangered Atlantic right whale.

The decision support tool that this amendment would block is used by States to determine how they can ensure they are taking steps to protect these whales. Preventing its use would, therefore, remove the ability of the States to make their own determination.

Consequently, NOAA would be forced to set a national standard. Additionally, given the way it is drafted, this amendment would block NOAA's conservation work on right whales, not just in the Atlantic, but also in the Pacific.

Other agencies that rely on this tool include the Coast Guard and Navy, who rely on it to ensure that they are in compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

As I said earlier, I understand my friend's concern, and I would support funding to help develop new and more whale-friendly fishing gear and other

mitigation options. I cannot, however, support an amendment that removes a scientific tool to make informed natural resource management decisions. It would only further endanger these majestic animals.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the tool that we are talking about was developed by a consensus-based take reduction team that included the consensus support of all representatives of the fishing industry who sat on that team, the entire Maine delegation, that the team unanimously supported the decision.

Mr. Chair, an end-run around that congressionally mandated process at this critical moment, taking away the lifeline that the North Atlantic right whale needs as it teeters on the brink of extinction, is the wrong way to protect Maine lobstermen. We can work together on other threats, other ways to help the lobstermen.

We need to start that conversation with climate change. Certainly, the trade impacts to the lobstermen and other fishing communities should be something we do to help them, the threat of offshore drilling in the Atlantic. And let's get them some more financial support if there is too much burden to implement the technologies and strategies that have been represented here.

But the North Atlantic right whale is running out of time, and we should not move the goalpost on these critically endangered species in this way.

Mr. Chair, I request a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 49, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)(increased by \$2,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to address the critical need to support both our law enforcement and individuals in our communities who are experiencing mental health crisis.

Across this country, one in every ten calls for police response involves a person experiencing a mental health crisis; one in four people killed by police are suffering from a mental illness; one in three people transported to hospital emergency rooms for psychiatric reasons are taken by the police.

Simply put, our police officers are on the front lines in our Nation where far too few people have access to the mental healthcare they need and deserve. But far too few have the training and the skills they need to understand, identify, and deescalate these situations.

We need to provide our officers with the skills and understanding of mental illness and how to appropriately respond to both the safety of the officer and the individual. The right training makes everyone safer. We must equip officers for encounters with people experiencing mental health crises, and my amendment helps to accomplish this goal.

With this amendment, we can help save lives and turn these encounters into effective responses that help both the individual and our communities. My amendment funds grants for crisis training for law enforcement through the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program. This program is giving State, local, and Tribal governments the critical support they need to provide individuals with important training and education, and equipment to operate at their best.

Byrne JAG is the leading source of funding for local law enforcement to help prevent and control crime, improve the justice system, and funds everything from education and intervention programs to reentry services to target the roots of crime. Some of its most well-known programs include the bulletproof vests program, Smart Policing Initiative, and the Juvenile Indictment Defense, the National Missing Unidentified Person System, and numerous other programs.

Byrne JAG is a critical funding source that makes our community safer by attacking the problem of crime from multiple angles, from community education to improving interactions with police and the neighborhoods they protect and, thus, is an excellent way to provide mental health crisis response training for our police officers.

Mr. Chair, in my State of Oklahoma, officers in 2018 alone transferred 17,860 individuals experiencing a mental health crisis to the emergency room.

Behavioral and psychological science has progressed leaps and bounds in the last 50 years, but access to that training is expensive, and we must break down cost barriers for law enforcement

agencies to save lives and address mental illness.

Mr. Chair, I look forward to, and urge, support on this amendment that will make our communities safer and address mental illness.

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

□ 1100

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. GOLDEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. KIM, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 54, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 55, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. GOLDEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to H.R. 3055 on behalf of my colleague, Representative ANDY KIM.

Over the past decade, more than 400 Veteran Treatment Courts have been established across our country. These courts address a serious problem to those who served. For veterans with post-traumatic stress, substance abuse simply compounds the issues that they face on a daily basis.

More than 2 out of 10 veterans with post-traumatic stress also experience substance abuse problems. These are service men and women who gave much to our country, only to come back and struggle long after their time in uniform has come to an end.

As representatives of a grateful Nation, we owe them solutions to the problems they face. Veteran Treatment Courts have been that solution for thousands of veterans and they continue to be so.

That is why this amendment would increase funding for this lifesaving program by \$1 million. That is funding to help provide an alternative to incarceration for those in need. That is funding to help improve access to mental health services and rehabilitative care. That is funding to improve the functionality of our local VA services and better serve those who served us.

This is a proven program that addresses a critical need in a community that has given much to this country.

Let's join together today to give something back to them.

With that, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment. I have seen these courts at work in such positive ways amongst my brothers and sisters who served in the military.

I want to thank Representative ANDY KIM for offering this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 33, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. Chair, when I visit a synagogue or Jewish community center in my congressional district these days, I usually pass by an armed security guard. Inside, there is talk about safe exit routes and the cost of adding bulletproof glass and other security enhancements.

When I visit mosques during Friday prayers, I have noticed that State Police officers generally, these days, are standing watch outside. My friends at Hindu and Sikh temples are worried as well.

There is a lot of angry, intolerant rhetoric in the United States and other countries like ours these days, and we know it comes from all sides of the political spectrum, but the guards at the gates of places of worship are not there because of a general fear of intolerance. They are there because of a specific threat from a specific group of people.

Domestic terrorists, white supremacists, or neo-Nazi terrorists, like those responsible for the attacks at the Tree of Life Congregation synagogue in Pittsburgh, the synagogue in Poway, California, and the mosque attack in Christchurch, New Zealand.

According to the Anti-Defamation League, 73 percent of terrorist killings in the United States since 2009 have been committed by domestic terrorists who spouted white supremacist ideology, as compared to 23 percent committed by Islamic extremists.

In 2018, there were 50 extremist murders in the United States. All 50 were

committed by adherents of far right-wing extremist groups. Anti-Semitic incidents rose by 60 percent from 2016 to 2017.

If this threat came from outside the United States, we would be consumed by it here in Congress, as we were when we awoke to the urgency of reorienting our national and homeland security strategy to fight al-Qaida after 9/11. That it is coming from within, from our fellow Americans, makes it more sensitive but no less urgent, and there is more work to be done.

Though the FBI acknowledges that domestic terrorists claim more lives in the United States than international terrorists, it has told us that its counterterrorism case numbers line up around 20 percent for domestic terrorism, 80 percent for international terrorism.

The Department of Justice's senior official for dealing with its Domestic Terrorism Counsel runs what is basically a one-man operation. And in the last 2 years we have actually cut funding at the Department of Homeland Security to counter domestic violent extremism.

This amendment begins to correct the imbalance. It would add \$1 million to the budget of DOJ's National Security Division to be directed to the Domestic Terrorism Counsel. In the underlying bill, we already recommend that the Counsel be elevated to have a Deputy Assistant Attorney General with adequate staff and resources.

The goal is to give a senior official at the Justice Department the stature and the tools needed to lead this effort so that we can focus as much attention on the rising threat of domestic terrorism as we have rightly devoted to the threat from groups like al-Qaida and ISIS.

So let us do more than just condemn anti-Semitism and other forms of hateful intolerance in this body. Let us actually do something practical to protect people from violence.

Mr. Chair, I urge bipartisan support for this amendment, and look forward to working with my colleagues on all sides to advance this goal in the year ahead.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 76, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 76, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Colorado (Neguse) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would provide an additional \$1 million increase to the NASA Office of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Engagement for the purpose of supporting the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program also known as Space Grant.

I first want to thank Chairman SERRANO and the House Appropriations Committee for providing \$48 million for the Space Grant Program, especially given that the President's fiscal year 2020 budget request proposed an entire elimination of not only the Space Grant Program, but also the entire Office of STEM Engagement.

Founded in 1989, the NASA Space Grant Program is made up of a national network of colleges and universities. It is a program that inspires, educates, and develops America's future technological workforce with hands-on projects, courses, and research, ensuring that our next generation is excited and equipped to thrive in our Nation's aeronautics and space programs.

I would be remiss if I didn't say that my district, Colorado's Second District, which I am proud to represent, is home to three Space Grant consortium members: Colorado State University in Fort Collins; the University of Colorado in Boulder; and Front Range Community College.

These institutions support almost 300 students, preparing them for successful STEM careers. In April, I was proud to lead a bipartisan letter with the entire Colorado delegation in support of this program.

The program doesn't just provide benefits to my home State, but to the entire country. Space Grants consist of over 850 affiliates and 52 total consortia across the country. There is one in every State, as well as the District of Columbia.

From reaching Mars, to exploring the depths of the galaxy, if we want to ensure that our Nation remains on a path of discovery and innovation, we must invest in our students and education.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment before them, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I have seen firsthand the positive impacts of NASA's Space Grant College and Fellowship Program in my home State of Alabama, and because of

the good work that has come out of that, I urge adoption of the amendment, to further our students' STEM education opportunities. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama, and as he articulated, I think there is incredible work happening with respect to the Space Grant Program in his State, in my State, and in States across the country.

With that, I appreciate the ability to offer the amendment, and I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 51, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of funding for a critical, life-saving program, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or NICS. We know that background checks save lives.

Since the NICS background check system was put into effect, over 38 million background checks have been conducted, preventing over 3 million firearm purchases from ending up in the wrong hands.

In 2018, Colorado conducted 340,816 checks against the NICS system with 6,279 denials. Making sure that guns are not sold to people who should not have them is one of the most important things we can do to prevent gun violence. But we can, and we must do more to strengthen the background check system.

The dangers of an incomplete system are clear. Just about 2 years ago in November of 2017, a gunman walked into a church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, and fatally shot more than two dozen people.

The shooter was prohibited from owning a firearm due to a domestic violence conviction he received while serving in the military, but the Air Force failed to upload the proper record to NICS, and the gunman was able to pass a background check and purchase the firearm that he used in that massacre.

In response to that incident, this body authorized additional funds to

support the efforts of States and Federal agencies to submit critical criminal history and mental health records to NICS. The need for these funds was underscored just 2 months ago in April in my home State of Colorado.

A Florida woman who should not have been able to buy a gun and could not have bought one in her home State, traveled to Colorado, passed a background check, and purchased a shotgun. Schools around the region were forced to close as authorities searched for the woman following credible threats made to schools across the Front Range.

These episodes underscore why it is so critically important that we increase funding for the NICS program so that we can continue to enhance it and improve it, and ultimately save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment to try to prevent gun violence in our country. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

1115

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MS. OCASIO-CORTEZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 35, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 54, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 55, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment moving \$5 million from the Drug Enforcement Administration into the Comprehensive Opioid Abuse Program, which is part of the Department of Justice funding of initiatives to combat the opioid epidemic.

I offer this amendment because ending the war on drugs has to mean changing our priorities in order to keep all communities safe and healthy. The best way we do that is by offering people the help and support they need before arrest and criminalization should be considered in the first place.

The amendment is a relatively commonsense one. As of now, the DEA will be funded at \$2.36 billion, which is nearly a \$90 million 1-year increase and \$77.7 million above even the President's request.

The Bronx has an unprecedented opioid crisis with deadly overdoses nearly doubling in just a few years. As families across our Nation know, the opioid crisis is not limited just to the Bronx. Just yesterday in the Oversight and Reform Committee, we heard testimony from medical experts and providers, and the testimony from Nurse Gray from West Virginia struck me. She said that we cannot arrest ourselves out of this. We have to make sure that we are caring for people in order to prevent this crisis from exploding.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my colleague from the Bronx's amendment.

Opioids are a serious threat to the health and well-being of our communities, and we must do everything we can to combat this epidemic.

Within the Department of Justice grant programs, the bill provides \$501 million in funding, an increase of \$33 million for grants to combat the crisis. This funding includes drug and veterans courts, residential treatment, and for the first time, a grant program for Law Enforcement Assistance Diversion, or LEAD, which seeks to get individuals into treatment and out of the criminal justice system.

The addition of this amendment further strengthens a bill that increases grants for treatment and prevention.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, it should be noted here that the comprehensive opioid addiction grants in this bill have been increased by 360 percent since they were created in 2017. Of course, opioid abuse and addiction is a very big problem in this country, and, certainly, we need to work on that, so I do not oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

But please know, it should be noted that we have increased this by 360 percent, but we want to work with both sides to make sure that we have the appropriate funds necessary to make sure we fight this opioid addiction that has taken over so many parts of the country.

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Mr. Chair, I think in that common spirit and our desire to make sure that we address the opioid epidemic, just as the epidemic is exploding, so should our commitment to address this problem.

This amendment is supported by the NAACP, the ACLU, the Drug Policy Alliance, and dozens of other organiza-

tions. Again, this is a relatively commonsense amendment. We have overfunded one agency, and we should move that to make sure we are getting people the care that they need.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

My amendment addresses the misguided use of solitary confinement within our Nation's prison systems and the harmful impact it has on incarcerated populations.

Solitary confinement is torture. For people with mental health issues, landing in solitary not only produces behaviors that yield more time in solitary, but it can also extend prison sentences, sometimes drastically. For these already vulnerable people, solitary confinement generates a cycle of punishment that for some can literally be endless.

In many prisons in this country, the de facto penalty for even minor prison rules violations, including those obviously caused by psychological distress or disability, has become solitary confinement. The isolation of solitary almost inevitably causes a measurable deterioration in mental health, which in turn leads to more behavioral issues punished with more solitary confinement.

Oftentimes, someone who was only supposed to spend a couple of years in prison ends up spending the rest of their life there, or they end up returning because they have been so damaged by solitary confinement that they can't adjust to life outside of prison.

This vicious cycle of violence must end. Individuals with underlying psychological disabilities are already overrepresented in prisons and jails, and this inhumane, inexcusable punishment is only perpetuating those problems. That is why we must put an end to solitary confinement once and for all.

I believe that, together, we can reform this cycle.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment. My colleague sends an important message by calling attention to the misuse and overuse of solitary confinement in Federal correction and detention.

In 2016, the National Institute of Justice issued a detailed study of the use of restrictive housing in U.S. detention. In addition, the Office of Inspector General in 2017 reported on the use of restrictive housing for mentally ill persons in the custody of BOP and included 15 recommendations to improve how BOP treats such inmates.

While solitary confinement represents a small percentage of restrictive housing, it is particularly concerning because of evidence that its use can be harmful and even counterproductive to correctional objectives.

Mr. Chair, I encourage the Department to take note of the concerns expressed here, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, the goal of the Department of Justice is to house inmates in the least restrictive environment that is possible and at the same time provide safety and security for the staff, for the inmate population, and to the public in general.

Just as in the community, disruptive individuals occasionally need to be placed in a jail or a holding facility to maintain the safety of its residents. The Bureau of Prisons has to place disruptive inmates in restrictive housing in order to maintain safety and security for the overall well-being of all the inmates.

The appropriate and reasonable use of restrictive housing is critical to the safety of the staff and to the Bureau's policies and procedures, and they try to strike an appropriate balance between the safety of those individuals who are on the staff there working at the Bureau of Prisons but also for the inmates themselves.

Restrictive housing involves two inmates per cell, in the vast majority of cases, and the inmates have daily access to staff and to programming. It is only in very rare cases that inmates are in a single cell in restrictive housing—for example, an inmate who has killed a cellmate or an inmate who has made repetitive or credible threats to kill anyone who is housed with him.

Every year, we mourn the loss of dedicated corrections professionals who lose their lives while they are working to ensure our Nation's inmates can no longer harm members of the community and harm each other.

We must not attempt to substitute our judgment here on this House floor

for that of the highly trained corrections professionals at the Bureau of Prisons and the United States Marshals Service. I think to do so would be a disservice and would make their jobs even more dangerous.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

Page 53, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill that would increase funding for the court-appointed special advocate, or CASA, and guardian ad litem programs.

In 2017, nine out of every 1,000 American children were victims of abuse or neglect. These experiences have a lasting effect, impacting a child's future in ways that are often not apparent in the days, weeks, or months after the trauma of abuse or neglect occurs. Providing support and advocacy for these children can make an enormous difference in their lives, and that is where the CASA program comes in.

CASA serves abused, neglected, and abandoned children through the recruitment and training of volunteers who advocate on behalf of children in courtrooms and other settings.

Mr. Chair, imagine being a 6-year-old child suffering from parental abuse. Home is not a safe place, and the secret that you, at only 6 years old, carry with you every day prevents you from speaking to your friends and your teachers and keeps you from making friends and building relationships.

Now, Mr. Chair, imagine that a neighbor calls the police after overhearing abuse. You are finally removed from a home that is filled with traumatic memories, but you are now looking at a scary and uncertain future in the foster system, and you will have to face your abuser in court.

That is where the CASA program comes in. They step in to provide a life-line, a guide, a friend, and an advocate for the child. Every year, more than

85,000 volunteers advocate on behalf of the 260,000 children who experience abuse and neglect. CASA advocates help these children find their voices or even speak for them as they navigate the child welfare system.

CASA of Orange County has worked with more than 7,050 children in the 34 years that the program has served our community, and they have trained nearly 3,500 volunteers.

CASA of Orange County used essential funding to support Malena, an 11-year-old Orange County resident diagnosed with autism. In the 2½ years that she was in foster care, Malena lived in a group home, a foster home, a nurturing relative placement, and then a group home again. Throughout all of those changes, Malena had one consistent person in her life that she knew she could count on, her court-appointed special advocate.

That CASA was a steady force in attending countless meetings with her team to support and advocate for her needs. But her relationship with her CASA was so much more, teaching her things that she missed in childhood, such as how to tie her shoes, how to count money, how to write her name, and when her birthday was.

At CASA of Orange County and other CASAs across the country, their mantra is "I am for the child."

As a mother of three children, I am proud to stand here as an advocate for children in Orange County and across the country who experience abuse and neglect.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 48, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 53, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill that would increase funding for sexual assault kit backlogs, helping us to test the hundreds of thousands of untested rape kits across the country.

I have 5 minutes to speak about my amendment today, and during this time, three people in this country will suffer sexual assault.

□ 1130

That works out to every 92 seconds someone is sexually assaulted in our country. Let me repeat that: every 92 seconds. And, in most cases, the perpetrators of these sexual assaults will never be held accountable. According to the Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network, only 5 out of every 1,000 rapists will end up in prison.

We have an opportunity today to support victims of sexual assault by increasing funding to process the backlog of sexual assault kits that are waiting to be tested across the country. Having the data and information that a sexual assault kit can provide is essential to solving sexual assaults and preventing future assaults.

In my home State of California, there are 13,615 kits untested. We are failing every single one of those 13,615 victims whose rape kit is sitting and waiting for our attention, and we are failing tens of thousands more across the country, including those who will be sexually assaulted by a perpetrator whose DNA will sit untested for a crime already committed.

It costs an average of \$1,000 and \$1,500 to test a single rape kit. The lack of critical funding needed for these testing kits is the primary factor in the ever-growing backlog of untested kits. In 2016, the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance gave Orange County a nearly \$2 million grant to process more than 3,500 unprocessed kits, to investigate and prosecute cases, and to reengage survivors.

My amendment, which increases the funding in this legislation by \$1 million, could help test approximately another 1,000 rape kits in California and across the country. The amendment would bring the total funding up to \$50 million, which will only provide enough Federal funding for the testing of up to 50,000 kits. While that is enough to give answers to the 13,000 sexual assault victims waiting for analysis and help in California, because of a lack of data nationwide, we don't know exactly how many sexual assault kits are waiting in this country.

This funding likely isn't enough, and we know that. But Congress must do more to ensure that we are supporting the victims of sexual assault in this country. Increasing funding can play an important role, while it is not alone enough.

We need to support our State and local partners in addressing the backlog of rape kits through increased funding, through new policies for kit testing, and through improved training for those in the field.

I hope that this increase in funding helps us continue the conversation and raise more awareness about sexual assault and about the kit backlog.

I hope that survivors of sexual assault know that Members of Congress

are fighting for them, and I hope they hear me and believe that this fight for justice won't end with this amendment. We need to support the victims of sexual assault across this country who deserve to have their kits tested, who deserve justice. We can and must do more.

Mr. CHAIR. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CLEAVER). Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I don't oppose the amendment.

I think that this is a very important issue, and I think this needs to be dealt with. Increased funding to reduce the sexual assault kit backlog is very important, so we support the amendment.

Mr. CHAIR. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, during a recent Oversight and Reform Committee hearing, of which I am a member, on Ban the Box, an advocate and formerly incarcerated mother testified that "People do not go to prison; families do."

From personal experience and a career spent in community and advocating on behalf of families destabilized by mass incarceration, I know firsthand the trauma that comes from having a parent involved in the criminal justice system.

We must break the chains that keep families ensnared by the mass incarceration system generation after generation. We must end the prison industrial complex that has brought so much devastation and trauma to many families and communities.

As many as 2.7 million children have at least one parent in prison or jail.

That is 1 in 9 Black children, 1 in 28 Latino children, and 1 in 57 White children. Too many children are bearing the trauma, the shame, and the stigma that often comes along with having a parent or caregiver incarcerated.

In the Massachusetts Seventh, which I am fortunate to represent, a Boston reentry study that tracked formerly incarcerated men and women found that over half of respondents had less than \$400 in their pockets upon release from prison; about a third went to unstable or temporary housing in shelters and transitional housing programs, motels, or on the street; and fewer than half were in paid employment after 2 months.

Mass incarceration and the lingering effects of a criminal record have a profound impact on families. From unemployment and financial instability to eviction and hunger for families involved in our criminal injustice system, incarceration is, quite literally, a shared sentence.

As lawmakers, as mothers, as fathers, as brothers, as sisters, we can and must do better.

My amendment would increase funds to support the Children of Incarcerated Parents Program and help reduce the harms of parental incarceration and alleviate generational trauma. In the wealthiest Nation on Earth, we must ensure that all families can truly have a second chance. Funding for these programs will help provide that.

Mr. CHAIR. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which would provide increased funding to support the DOJ's Community-Based Violence Prevention program. This program provides crucial funding to tackle the epidemic of violence ravaging our communities.

In my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, this program supports the Boston Public Health Commission's Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative. The VIP Initiative specifically operates in neighborhoods severely impacted by gun violence but

maintains strong community infrastructure. Each neighborhood has its own resident coalition that is coordinated by a local organization with deep ties to the community.

VIP, like other similar programs, empowers communities by providing the knowledge and resources necessary to create long-term solutions to the persistent socioeconomic and systemic issues sustaining the public health epidemic of gun violence.

Violence begets violence. Whether it is domestic violence, sexual violence, gun violence, or gang and street violence, we must stop treating it as an issue of law and order but, rather, invest in the public and social needs of our most vulnerable people and communities.

My amendment will support initiatives that are led and informed by the community to help stem the violence devastating our communities. It centers those closest to the pain closest to the power and the solutions.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 26, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

This bipartisan amendment removes and adds \$2 million from the Legal Activities account at the Department of Justice.

I would like to make the intent of this amendment clear, that Congress is directing the DOJ's Environment and Natural Resources Division to allocate \$2 million to enforce our Nation's animal welfare laws.

Congress has taken meaningful steps over the past several decades, and especially in the past few years, to improve animal welfare and rid this country of heartless cruelty toward animals. These improvements include the passage of legislation like the Horse Protection Act, the crush video law, the Animal Welfare Act and animal fighting laws, which received overwhelming bipartisan support.

While our animal rights laws have improved, there are currently insufficient resources to ensure that these laws are being adequately enforced.

The Environment and Natural Resources Division, or ENRD, oversees many important functions, including pollution cleanup and wildlife protection. This division also has the unique responsibility to prosecute animal welfare crimes. ENRD lawyers at the Department of Justice are doing the best they can to defend the humane treatment of captive, farmed, and companion animals across the country, but there are currently not enough resources being allocated for them to go after animal welfare crimes.

Failure to adequately enforce these laws harms communities and animals—the truly voiceless. Failure to enforce these laws leaves animals to suffer tremendously at the hands of people who force animals to fight to the death for pure entertainment and/or other cruel actions.

Mr. Chair, I use this opportunity to urge DOJ to coordinate with USDA and continue working with the U.S. Attorney's offices to prosecute and investigate animal welfare crimes. Specifically, DOJ should create a dedicated animal cruelty crimes unit and allow for robust enforcement of animal welfare crimes. There should be dedicated personnel, including prosecutors, focused solely on these offenses.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

□ 1145

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) for her incredible leadership on an issue we should all be able to agree upon: protecting all of God's creatures, great and small.

When Congress creates laws, we intend for them to be enforced. That is pretty simple. The Stevens amendment would help the Department of Justice do exactly that.

This issue is bigger than senseless animal abuse. There is an established link between animal fighting and abuse and drug trafficking and gang activity. This means that laws protecting animals also protect our communities.

This amendment is common sense, and I urge support.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of Division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to argue, in the conduct of any litigation to which the United States, or an agency or officer thereof is a party, that any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) or of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), is unconstitutional or is invalid or unenforceable on any ground, including that certain provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are not severable from section 5000A of that Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will prevent Federal funds from being used by the Department of Justice to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

The people of the Illinois 14th elected me to protect coverage for preexisting conditions and to make healthcare and prescription drugs more affordable. Under this administration, the Department of Justice is refusing to defend the law of the land, risking access to affordable care for 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions, including 5.4 million Illinoisans.

If this administration succeeds in overturning the Affordable Care Act through the courts, it would destroy protections for people with preexisting conditions, the ban on lifetime and annual limits on health coverage, the Medicaid expansion covering 15 million Americans, health insurance affordability tax credits assisting 9 million Americans, bans on discriminatory insurance practices that force women to pay more for coverage, young adults' ability to remain on their parents' insurance until 26, and more.

This is unacceptable, and to do it on the dime of the taxpayer is unconscionable.

130 million Americans depend on it, and one of those Americans is Mike DeBow, of Shorewood, Illinois. Mike has type 1 diabetes and wrote to me because he is “deathly afraid” of losing his insurance. He is thankful for the protections of the Affordable Care Act that allow him to stay on his parents' plan and ensure insurance companies can't discriminate against him because of his preexisting condition.

We cannot go back, back to the days before the Affordable Care Act when insurers were in the driver's seat, allowed to sell substandard plans that didn't cover the care people needed, and left patients holding the bag. We cannot go back to the days when 50 million people in this country were uninsured, locked out because of pre-existing conditions.

The American people sent a resounding message last November: They want their healthcare protected. They want their healthcare to be affordable. We should be working toward that aim, not using taxpayer dollars to try to sabotage it for political gain.

For example, we passed legislation in this House that would protect people with preexisting conditions, H.R. 1010, and another bill, the Health Care Affordability Act, that I proposed, which would reduce premium costs for approximately 20 million Americans and offer at least 9 million people who are currently uninsured lower cost coverage.

That is what we should be doing for the American people: using our offices to make their lives better, healthier, safer, and more affordable. For some, like Mike DeBow, this is literally life and death.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

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

This administration remains committed to providing more affordable healthcare options to all Americans, and debating the prospects of future judicial action will not help us, as a Congress, deliver on our promise to bring better healthcare to our constituents. The administration has promised to ensure that, regardless of the outcome, they will support the legislation to address any legal determination.

In addition, let me say, it is not appropriate for Congress to tell the executive branch what positions it should take in court. Litigation strategy is the responsibility and the prerogative of the Department of Justice.

As the Attorney General recently testified during one of our committee hearings here on Capitol Hill, he said that they should be able to advance what he believes are defensible and reasonable legal positions, and I believe that certainly to be the case.

The Attorney General has concluded that the position of the States that challenge the ACA and the district courts is a defensible and reasonable legal position for the Department to take.

Questions of constitutionality should be determined by the courts and not through a partisan debate on funding limitation to an appropriations bill. So, therefore, Mr. Chair, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time. Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise to support the amendment.

When, in March, the Justice Department broke with the principle that its core mission should be to defend, not sabotage, the law of the land, it went too far.

The White House is entitled to push its own policy position on healthcare—it has made no secret of its hostility to the Affordable Care Act, despite never offering an alternative of any kind—but it cannot pick and choose which laws to support.

My friends across the aisle criticized the Obama administration for its use of prosecutorial discretion. In this case, the Department is not just neglecting to defend the law, it is using appropriated funds to directly attack it.

This amendment will, hopefully, stop that, and that is why I strongly support it.

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED) for his leadership in introducing legislation at the beginning of this Congress that allowed this body, the U.S. House of Representatives, to defend the Affordable Care Act in the existing litigation.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Ranking Member ADERHOLT and Chairman SERRANO for working together on the bipartisan en bloc package that passed the House yesterday. That package included my amendment to increase funding for the International Trade Administration by \$2 million to provide additional funding for enforcement and compliance activities.

Unfair trade practices directly harm our domestic manufacturing and agri-

cultural sectors. The U.S. Customs and Border Protection reports that there are nearly 55,000 unpaid antidumping and countervailing duty bills covering fiscal years 2011 through 2016, totaling \$2.8 billion in uncollected duties. This is a critical issue for my district.

Americans who eat U.S.-grown strawberries in the colder winter months are probably eating a strawberry grown and harvested by the hardworking farmers in Plant City, Florida. We are proud of our role in providing Americans access to U.S.-grown produce year-round.

However, the strawberry growers in my district are under attack. They are under attack from illegal "dumping" practices, and this must be stopped. The additional funding provided by my amendment is a step in the right direction to combat unfair trade practices so that U.S. producers can compete.

Again, I want to express my gratitude to Ranking Member ADERHOLT and Chairman SERRANO for including this amendment in the en bloc package that passed the House yesterday.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF GEORGIA

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 3 consisting of amendment Nos. 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, and 125 printed in part B of House Report 116-119, offered by Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Page 111, line 17, after the first dollar amount, inset "(reduced by \$3,000,000.00)".

Page 118, line 8, after the first dollar amount, inset "(increased by \$2,000,000.00)".

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

Page 115, line 14, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 168, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$100,000) (reduced by \$100,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 125 line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

Page 125, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 125, line 15, after the second dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Page 162, line 4, after the second dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MS. SEWELL OF ALABAMA

Page 154, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1) (reduced by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. BERA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000) (reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

At the end of division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . . There is appropriated, for salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency to carry out section 1621 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8792), \$1,996,000, to be derived from a reduction of \$2,000,000 in the amount provided in this Act for the item for “Office of the Secretary” and “Office of the Secretary—Office of Communications”.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 118, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. VEASEY OF TEXAS

Page 121, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,000,000) (increased by \$12,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. STEIL OF WISCONSIN

Page 125, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,500,000) (reduced by \$1,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,600,000)”.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000)”.

Page 110, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$600,000)”.

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,400,000)”.

Page 214, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 204, line 16, insert “, or any territory or possession of the United States” after “average”.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. JOYCE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 121, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000) (increased by \$15,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$200,000)”.

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$200,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 114, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1)(increased by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

Page 204, line 14, strike “1980, 1990,” and insert “1990”.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Page 112, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 113, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$353,000)”.

Page 153, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$353,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MRS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 157, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE OF MARYLAND

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. TRONE OF MARYLAND

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 110, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 119, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE OF IOWA

Page 114, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduce by \$1) (increased by \$1)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

Page 159, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MS. PRESSLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 109, line 7, after the second dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 206, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. SLOTKIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 119, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendments included in the en bloc were made in order by the rule, and they have been agreed to by both sides. They improve the bill. I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment as well.

I want to thank the Agriculture Subcommittee chairman, Mr. BISHOP, for working with our side to include many amendments that are important to our Members. The chairman has been a great partner and has been very fair throughout this process.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, as it reflects the will of many Members and also makes appropriate changes to the bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

□ 1200

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, I would like to thank so much the subcommittee chairperson, Mr. BISHOP, for allowing me this time.

My amendment is part of the en bloc, and it deals with wastewater treatment.

No person in America and living in this country should be allowed to not have adequate plumbing. This is why I have introduced an amendment asking the USDA to prioritize our ongoing efforts to address failing septic systems in rural communities.

Approximately 20 percent of Americans are responsible for the installation and maintenance of their own sewage disposal systems, which isn't provided by their municipalities or their county government. At least 200,000 families live in homes that lack a sewage system altogether.

We offer little assistance to people who live in unincorporated areas to have basic water and sewer. Rural communities across this country struggle with this issue.

Just this week, I read lots and lots of articles that dealt with the failure of those folks in rural communities to have adequate sewage systems.

This amendment is part of a multiyear effort to address this once and for all for all Americans.

Last year, my bill, the Rural Septic Tank Access Act, was included in the farm bill.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BISHOP and his staff for allowing me to speak on this underlying en bloc bill today.

In fiscal year 2018, we secured an additional \$1.8 billion in rural wastewater funding with the help of Congressman ADERHOLT.

Madam Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” for this en bloc amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague and ranking member, Mr. FORTENBERRY, for yielding, and I thank Chairman BISHOP for including my amendment in the en bloc amendments.

Agriculture research plays a critical role in the future of our food supply. In our last spending bill, we helped secure

a 5 percent increase in funding for the USDA's National Institute of Food and Agriculture. That program had seen increased funding because of bipartisan support on the House Agriculture Committee from many of the members, including my good friend and fellow co-chair of the Ag Research Caucus, JIMMY PANETTA of California, who fondly likes to remind us all that he represents the Salad Bowl of America.

This year, I led a bipartisan letter signed by 111 of my colleagues advocating for robust funding for USDA NIFA's Agriculture and Food Research Initiative in the 2020 appropriations and I am extremely excited that the House appropriators increased funding by \$45 million over fiscal year 2019 levels to \$460 million for NIFA and AFRI.

I am proud to see such bipartisan support for ag research, because ensuring research is necessary and vital.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. TRONE).

Mr. TRONE. Madam Chair, I am pleased that the four amendments I proposed to this bill will be made in order. These amendments reflect some of the most important priorities in my district.

First, they offer an amendment to increase funding for mental health courts, which lower the recidivism rate for justice-impacted individuals with mental illness.

My second amendment underlines the importance of modernizing the National Institute of Standards and Technology's infrastructure. This funding will help NIST remain a leader in driving economic growth in Maryland's Sixth District and across the country.

The last two amendments put additional funding toward expanding rural broadband deployment and combatting the opioid crisis in rural communities, two critical priorities of western Maryland.

Madam Chair, I thank Representatives Riggleman of Virginia and Neguse of Colorado for working with me on these amendments.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague from Nebraska and my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, for including this amendment in the en bloc.

I rise to support my amendment to support our dairy industry. I have visited farms across southeast Wisconsin, and time and time again, farmers have explained to me the challenges they have with consistently low milk prices.

That is why we need this amendment, so we can continue to invest in business development within the dairy industry and encourage new markets for our farmers.

This amendment provides \$1.5 million to support our Nation's dairy industry in a budget neutral way.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support our dairy industry, to sup-

port our farmers, and to support this amendment.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN).

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, Representative TRONE, with whom I have developed a bipartisan partnership that has resulted in these two amendments.

The first amendment increases funding for Community Connect Grants to connect broadband deployment into rural communities that are underserved by private sector investment.

Our rural communities, including some in my district, need access to broadband to keep up with the demands of the modern economy.

This amendment will help communities close the digital divide, which is critical to enhancing economic opportunity, job creation, access to healthcare, and education in rural America.

The next amendment, dear to my heart, increases funding for the Rural Health and Safety Education Program to combat the opioid epidemic in rural communities.

Representative TRONE and I and too many others in this body and in our country at large have seen friends and family members suffer and even pass away from the opioid crisis that has ravaged our country. Just last week, I lost my cousin to a heroin overdose.

This funding is an essential step to turn the crisis around.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support these two amendments.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I thank Ranking Member FORTENBERRY and Chairman BISHOP for including in this en bloc group amendment my bipartisan amendment No. 103 to provide funding for the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Payment Program for Geographically Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers.

This program in USDA will reimburse farmers and ranchers in Puerto Rico, as well as in other U.S. foreign territories, Hawaii and Alaska, a portion of the costs that they may incur when transporting their agricultural products or equipment.

Our farmers and ranchers outside the continental U.S. operate at a competitive disadvantage relative to producers in the 48 contiguous States, partly due to geographic barriers and high transportation costs.

This program will help us address this reality by providing payments to help ranchers and farmers in the non-contiguous States or territories offset some of these costs.

This program has been funded at \$1.9 million over the last couple of fiscal years, and my amendment will seek to provide the same amount of funding for

fiscal year 2020, with a corresponding offset.

Madam Chair, I want to thank Representatives GABBARD of Hawaii, PLASKETT of the U.S. Virgin Islands, and RADEWAGEN of American Samoa for cosponsoring my amendment, and I urge my colleagues to endorse it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, there are no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, at this time, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Madam Chair, we have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLÁN. Madam Chair, my amendment is intended to ensure that the Northern Mariana Islands Nutritional Assistance Program has enough funding, so that household income eligibility standards and benefit levels currently in place for FY19 are kept in place throughout FY20.

We do not want anyone removed from eligibility or barred from the program because there is not enough money next year.

We do not want anyone to have their benefits cut. We have worked hard and long to raise benefits in the Marianas to match neighboring Guam and to meet the true costs of food in our islands. We do not want that progress lost.

I do not expect cuts to happen. We provided generously for the Marianas in the disaster supplemental appropriation enacted earlier this month, Public Law 116-20. We appropriated \$25.2 million for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters—we had two last year: Typhoon Mangkut and Super Typhoon Yutu—and for emergencies. And we made the funds available for all fiscal year 2020.

The Marianas had already used \$10.6 million of our annual block grant and other monies to pay for disaster nutrition assistance in response to these two typhoons. It is the intent of Congress that the new disaster funding in Public Law 116-20 be applied retroactively to make whole those other funding sources.

Going forward, we are concerned about the economic emergency that has developed in the aftermath of the typhoons. Tourism, the primary driver of the economy, is down significantly; and Commonwealth government revenues have fallen. As a result, local government employees have had their hours reduced from 40 to 32 per week. Public school teachers are being forced to agree to a salary cut. The reduced consumer purchasing power will accelerate the economic downturn.

During the period of recession and government austerity that occurred from 2008 through 2012, the demand on the nutritional assistance program increased by 44 percent. This scenario may well now repeat. Congress recognizes that, because of the nexus between the typhoon disasters and the subsequent economic emergency, any new demand on the nutritional assistance program in fiscal year 2020 should be addressed with disaster funding provided in Public Law 116-20.

It is not certain, however, that the disaster supplemental appropriation will cover all contingencies.

To prepare for any eventuality, the amendment I offer makes clear that SNAP contingency funds are a permissible source should

the Marianas nutritional assistance program face a shortfall in fiscal 2020.

It is a “belt and suspenders” proposition. Only needed if, for some reason, disaster funds prove insufficient. This use of the contingency funds is statutorily authorized under the broad discretion given to the Secretary in 48 U.S.C. 1469d(c) to extend to the Marianas any program administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Secretary is also authorized to waive or modify any statutory requirements relating to the provision of assistance under such programs when he deems it necessary in order to adapt the programs to the Marianas needs.

My amendment makes clear Congress’ intent: that no household eligible for food assistance under the income standards in effect for FY19 will be denied benefits in FY20 and that the benefit amounts being provided in FY19 will not be reduced in FY20.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division B (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this division (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 14 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chair, my amendment is simple. It would reduce spending in this division by 14 percent, the amount that is needed to avoid busting the budget caps and preventing sequestration, which would compromise our national security.

This division would spend \$1.3 billion more than the 2019 enacted level.

In their quest to spend every taxpayer dollar from this generation and our future generations, my friends on the other side of the aisle have proposed spending packages that in total will bust the budget caps by nearly \$90 billion.

While my colleagues may be willing to put national security at risk to fulfill budget-busting policy promises, I will not.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I understand the gentleman’s intention, but I could not disagree more.

The agriculture bill funds a variety of national priorities from food safety, to agriculture research, to drug approval, to rural development, to nutrition programs for our children.

Reducing spending by 14 percent would hurt our farmers, who are already suffering terribly from retaliatory tariffs, and it would hurt small communities who are still in need of adequate broadband. It would hurt those who are waiting for cures to rare cancers. It would jeopardize America’s status as a leader of global agricultural science. It would slow our response to foodborne illness outbreaks. It would harm children and families who rely on these programs to put food on their tables.

The bill already rejected the administration’s draconian cuts to programs that assist our rural communities and vulnerable populations.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chair, we have got to think about the audacity of these claims.

I am not talking in my amendment about cutting any specific program. I am proposing an amendment to cut 14 percent across the board to prevent the excessive spending that we are seeing being proposed from across the aisle that would spend substantially more than what the Federal Government spent in the year before.

Madam Chair, we simply cannot afford this reckless proposal from my friends on the other side of the aisle.

My amendment offers Members a clear choice. If a Member votes “no,” that Member supports busting the budget caps and putting our national security at risk due to entering into sequestration, which is inevitable if we pass the spending measures being proposed from across the aisle.

However, by supporting my amendment, Members can show that they support fiscal sanity by honoring the budget caps and protecting our national security.

Madam Chair, I will continue to come back to this microphone over and over and over again and propose this same amendment to each nondefense spending division, because I promised my constituents in northeast Indiana that that is exactly what I would do if they elected me to Congress, that I would fight to reduce spending to rebuild our military and to support fiscal sanity in our Nation, once again, by fighting for balanced budgets and fiscally conservative spending measures.

□ 1215

This amendment fulfills all those promises to my constituents and fami-

lies in northeast Indiana, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I urge that this amendment be rejected.

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

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

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division B (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the draft guidance issued by the Food and Drug Administration in December 2017 titled “Drug Products Labeled as Homeopathic: Guidance for FDA Staff and Industry”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment that prevents funds from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the draft guidance issued by the Food and Drug Administration in December of 2017, titled, “Drug Products Labeled as Homeopathic Guidance for FDA Staff and Industry.”

The 2017 draft guidance actually upends three decades of settled enforcement practice in homeopathy without a compelling reason or with no directive from Congress. My amendment would prevent that overreach and maintain the safe and effective guidance that has been in place since 1987.

For decades, homeopathy has thrived as the fastest growing alternative to pharmaceuticals, and FDA estimates more than 3 million Americans use it. The products can be a natural alternative to addictive opioids in the management of pain and other conditions.

The current guidance provides a precise definition of a homeopathic product and clear manufacturing standards. Violations of these standards are already subject to FDA enforcement. The

proposed change in guidance goes too far by restricting access to safe homeopathic medicines, while also being less effective at regulating the safety and quality of homeopathic products.

The new guidance replaces clear definitions with a vague, risk-based approach. By its own admission, the FDA failed to consult with consumers and those in the homeopathic community before they drafted this guidance. The result is a poorly worded document that does not do what it purports to do.

Instead, this guidance covers all products labeled as homeopathic rather than distinguishing between those falsely labeled as homeopathic and those that are actually homeopathic medicines which have already been proven to be safe and effective. As written, the guidance threatens to limit access to safe and effective homeopathic medicines by subjecting them to new enforcement actions inconsistent with past practice and existing law.

The draft guidance purports to address improperly manufactured homeopathic products, and I support that, but the draft guidance drops the explicit manufacturing guidelines already contained in the existing guidance. Under the draft guidance, Americans would have fewer assurances that their homeopathic medicines are pure and properly manufactured.

The problems that FDA cites as reasons for introducing the draft guidance, falsely labeled products and improperly manufactured products, are actually better addressed under the current guidance, and the FDA has been effectively addressing these issues for the last 30 years.

This draft guidance is an unnecessary regulatory overreach, and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment primarily to engage in a discussion with the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, first let me say, I do understand the concerns of the gentleman from Arizona.

Here is the issue: The Food and Drug Administration is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that persons seeking to be healed have both the right to try innovative products as well as the right to be protected from harm or any false claims.

So let me say to my friend, Mr. BIGGS, we would like to offer this: Chairman BISHOP and I would seek the opportunity to have the FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, meet with us to dialogue on the very important issues that you are raising and to relay your concerns. I will commit to you that your objections will be conveyed to their leadership before they move forward on this guidance.

So, in light of that consideration, I kindly, respectfully request that the

gentleman consider withdrawing the amendment.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for his comments and Ranking Member FORTENBERRY's assurances that we can get together with the FDA and see what we can do to resolve this very difficult issue. I look forward to working with him on this issue going forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MR. PENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "reduced by \$25,000,000".

Page 158, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to increase funding for the Distance Learning and Telemedicine broadband grant program.

Currently, over 14 million Americans living in rural communities still lack access to basic broadband service. Specifically, the rural broadband grant programs at USDA help Americans tap into telehealth technology, distant learning education, and internet-based agribusiness that our farmers desperately rely on to remain competitive.

In my district, the DLT grant program has been successful at linking teachers in one area to students in another. Last year, almost half of the funds from the DLT program were used to combat opioid and substance abuse.

The ongoing opioid crisis is still wreaking havoc on communities across America, and this is not the time to cut corners on programs that address this problem. We must support efforts to help people seeking treatment for and prevention of opioid use.

My amendment, which is fully offset, will increase funding for the DLT program by \$25 million so that more communities have access to healthcare, education, government services, and business opportunities. Without broadband access, entire communities are being left behind.

Madam Chair, I am thankful this issue has remained a bipartisan priority, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The Distance Learning and Telemedicine program offers grants to rural areas to provide access to education, to training, and to healthcare. These resources are critical in providing funding to acquire audio, video, and other advanced technology equipment to extend educational and medical services, including those seeking opioid treatment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, I thank Chairman BISHOP for yielding the time and for his eloquent remarks.

I just want to rise, even though we are under the guise of opposition, to actually thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. We have had substantive, thoughtful, lengthy discussions about broadband and its importance to rural revitalization, as the gentleman well put, and it is more than just wires laid. It is about creating an ecosystem of livability.

In his words, the gentleman touched on those very points. I think the gentleman would be proud to see the underlying work here in that regard, but he has made it better.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, the amendment would bring the total funding for the program to \$75 million in our bill. This program provides grants to encourage and improve telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas through telecommunications and other technologies, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for offering it. It enhances the bill.

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), my esteemed colleague.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my esteemed colleague's amendment to increase the funding for the Distance Learning and Telemedicine grant program at the USDA.

In Indiana, many of our rural areas do not have access to adequate broadband coverage, putting them at a disadvantage in our global economy. In Indiana, many of our rural areas do not have the access that is necessary to be current.

Broadband is important to education and healthcare, as well as economic development and agriculture. By responsibly increasing the funding for this program, we are providing educational opportunities and improved healthcare without any additional cost to the taxpayer.

We must equip our students with our 21st century tools to further their education and ensure that all of our citizens have access to quality healthcare, regardless of their ZIP Code. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment on behalf of rural communities across the Nation.

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to close the digital divide in rural America.

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

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

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1230

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MS. SPANBERGER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 109, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 109, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 109, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 111, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$12,500,000)”.

Page 114, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$30,000,000)”.

Page 207, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$55,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055.

Across the country, insufficient rural broadband access is creating a divide between those who are connected and those who are not. That is why my amendment increases funding for the USDA’s ReConnect Program by \$55 million, representing a 10 percent increase over last year’s funding.

According to the FCC’s 2019 Broadband Deployment Report, one in four rural Virginians lacks access to high-speed internet. This digital divide can lead to consequences that impact educational and economic opportunities across our rural communities. This figure is even more stark when you hear from those affected.

Earlier this year, I sent out a survey to learn more about how the lack of reliable broadband internet is directly impacting the people I serve here in the House of Representatives. I received more than 100 responses in a short amount of time from families, students, and business owners across our district. Take, for example:

Regina from Louisa, who says that the lack of consistent, reliable internet services hinders everything her family does, from receiving reliable emergency notifications to paying their bills in a timely fashion;

Jasmine from Spotsylvania takes online classes at home, but the lack of access to broadband internet has barred her from accessing assignments that she needs to complete in order to obtain her degree; and

Robyn from Amelia County, who works on her family’s beef and cattle farm, says: “When the internet is down, I can’t do simple things like process payments, send liability payments, or check the radar for our guys out in the fields.”

For every Regina, Jasmine, and Robyn, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans with similar stories. To level the playing field for our rural residents, we need to make sure broadband internet is a component of our national conversation about infrastructure. That is why I believe we need to expand existing programs such as USDA’s ReConnect Program.

This program allows communities to apply for Federal funding to strengthen and expand their regional broadband infrastructure, but the current scope of these programs is insufficient to meet the scale of the challenge and the demand. In the first round of ReConnect Program grant applications this year, USDA saw a nearly 3-to-1 ratio in application funding requested versus the actual amount of funding available.

My amendment would increase the funding for the USDA ReConnect Program from \$550 to \$605 million, and I am proud to lead this bipartisan effort to provide greater connectivity to rural America.

This extra \$55 million is not the magic solution, but it demonstrates that one of our priorities here in Congress is to keep our rural communities strong; and when rural America is strong, it makes our country as a whole even stronger.

By helping our rural neighbors close the broadband gap, we are allowing the rural communities to attract new businesses, spur economic growth, and give their kids an equal opportunity to succeed in a global, hyperconnected economy.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

There is wide support and recognition as to the need for investing in broadband infrastructure. As a necessity for modern life, we must continue our efforts to bridge the broadband divide to ensure that as many rural Americans as possible receive fast and reliable broadband service and the multitude of benefits that are associated with it.

Madam Chair, the gentlewoman’s amendment, if adopted, would bring broadband funding to the highest level since 2009, with the Recovery Act. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It will certainly enhance this bill.

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

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

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MS. UNDERWOOD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 115 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division B (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove the term “climate change” from any publication of any entity for which such funds are made available.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment, which will prevent Federal agencies like the U.S. Department of Agriculture from removing existing public information about long-term weather variation in our climate. This information gives farmers the tools they need to succeed, and it is important that we don’t subject it to politics.

I am proud to represent a community rich in agriculture in the Illinois 14th

District. We have the best farmers in the world, but right now they are facing real challenges to their businesses and their way of life caused by long-term patterns in weather variation, leading to worse seasonal extremes.

The science is clear: Extreme weather has links to human-induced climate change.

Climate change has broad impacts on virtually all aspects of the agriculture industry. Ignoring the link between climate change and extreme weather is a direct threat to our national security, to food security, and to the livelihoods of farmers in northern Illinois and throughout America.

This year, catastrophic flooding and rain in Illinois have prevented many farmers from planting their crops. As of this week, only 88 percent of farmers in Illinois were able to plant their corn, compared with a 4-year average of 100 percent between 2014 and 2018. Meanwhile, only 70 percent of soybeans are planted, compared to a 4-year average of 95 percent.

Nationwide, farmers are expected to harvest the smallest corn crop in 4 years, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And I have spoken to farmers who are concerned that an early frost could threaten entire farm operations this year because of late planting and more unpredictable weather patterns.

This is an immediate threat. We are already suffering the consequences, and it will only get worse with time.

The very existence of multigenerational farms and an entire way of life for some families in our community are at risk. And once these farms are gone, they aren't coming back.

Make no mistake. Due to drought, severe storms, an early spring, and flooding, our farmers are on the front line when it comes to climate change.

Unfortunately, over the past 2 years, references to climate change, long-term weather variation, and the effect of human activity on our climate has been scrubbed from many Federal websites and publications.

Farmers are veterinarians, entrepreneurs, accountants, meteorologists, and scientists—all in one day. By deleting information and references to climate change in official communication, we hamstring their ability to rely on accurate and precise information to make important business decisions and adapt their farming practices to face future challenges.

Information on climate change and its impact on agriculture is also valuable to researchers and innovators working on technology to support farming communities throughout the country and to policymakers as we work to make informed choices that address these issues.

We have the capacity and a responsibility to address the challenges of climate change head-on as a country. American farmers are some of the most hardworking, resilient, and optimistic people in the country. Their hard work

nourishes our families and literally feeds the world.

We can and must ensure that they are equipped to be successful, because their success not only affects our community's economy, but a secure food supply depends on it. This amendment will ensure that USDA and other Federal agencies will continue to make important information available to farmers at a time when they need it most.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Chair, trying to control what words USDA officials use to describe changing weather conditions should not really be our focus.

For one, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem. USDA has plenty of materials on their website or elsewhere with the term "climate change" embedded in them. If the USDA were going to completely wipe away this terminology for political purposes, which was implied, they would have done so over the past 2½ years.

Secondly, the amendment attempts to politicize an issue that does not need further politicization. For example, Chairman BISHOP and I were able to have a civil discussion on changing climate in a subcommittee hearing this year without dragging controversy into it. In addition to outside witnesses, USDA actually sent up a subject matter expert on the very topic. We had a hearing where we talked about how to deal with changing weather and how our farmers and ranchers could adjust to such changes.

Instead of spending time on this type of messaging, let's spend our time on actually helping our farmers and ranchers and building a more secure and sustainable energy future that benefits all of America.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. As I have said before, Congress' oversight role is one of the most important functions. That function extends to preserving the integrity of science.

The academics, economists, and researchers at USDA produce top-notch scientific reports characterizing the state of the farm economy, the agricultural industry at large, and analyzing future impacts. It is clear that one of

the most important stressors on agriculture today and in the coming years will be the effects of climate change.

We cannot prevent the effects of climate change by simply removing any reference to it in the Department's scientific publications. We must allow the science community to do its work, free from political influence.

Madam Chair, I have no objection to the proposed amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that the amendment No. 121 will not be offered.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, and I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a superb chair of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, and I rise to discuss an issue very important to America's livestock and poultry farmers, the Packers and Stockyards Act.

For decades, the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, familiarly known as GIPSA, was a stand-alone agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Until recently, GIPSA was a parallel agency to the Agricultural Marketing Service itself. But under Secretary Sonny Perdue's reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and consolidation plan, GIPSA was moved deep within the Agricultural Marketing Service—some fear buried.

Now, the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Fair Trade Practices Branch within the Agricultural Marketing Service administers the Packers and Stockyards Act.

Do you see the layers?

This consolidation will increase difficulty for farmers who seek relief from unfair and abusive practices common—unfortunately—in the livestock and poultry sectors.

The administration recently announced a rulemaking process to define criteria the Secretary will consider to determine violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act on whether an undue or unreasonable preference or advantage occurred.

I welcome this action.

□ 1245

These terms were never adequately defined or explained. However, I am very concerned this administration is

utilizing delays and stalling tactics through this rulemaking process.

For several years, the previous administration's rulemaking process was blocked through appropriations riders. Year after year, I fought those riders.

Finally, Congress reacted to the public backlash over the riders and backed off efforts to block the rule. This enabled the last administration to move forward and to comply with the 2008 farm bill requirements. However, the rulemaking was not complete. With the turnover in administrations, Secretary Perdue quickly stopped all work on these rules and demoted the agency in charge of the effort.

It seems a positive step that the Secretary decided to advance new rules to clarify criteria used to enforce the undue and unreasonable preference or advantage authorities. However, given the administration's previous actions, I am quite concerned that this rulemaking will fall far short of addressing the worst abuses that America's livestock and poultry farmers experience.

There are gross examples of abusive contracting practices, particularly in the poultry sector. Companies greatly disadvantage certain growers at the expense of others. The thumb of justice surely seems obsolete. Protection against retaliation, pay transparency, and a right to a fair and just legal system are essential to protect our hard-working farmers from abuse.

Each of these concerns must be addressed in the rulemaking process. The alarming realities of the poultry industry and similar ones in the hog and beef industries highlight the imbalance within today's corporate meat production hierarchy. This must be addressed through USDA's planned Packers and Stockyards Act rulemaking process.

I hope the administration will better protect small farmers who work very hard every day to help feed our Nation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague's longtime support for fair trade practices for our livestock and for our poultry farmers.

I have worked on this issue over the years with the gentlewoman, and I, too, share her concerns regarding the GIPSA rules and the administration's past history in such rulemakings.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Ohio as the administration takes steps toward complying with the farm bill requirements from 2008.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, as the designee of Chair LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to continue to work with the gentleman and the Appropriations

Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies to fight the administration's reprehensible attempts to increase hunger in our country, including through USDA's proposed and harmful able-bodied adults without dependents rule.

As the gentleman well knows, SNAP is a critical antihunger program that helps many families struggling with food insecurity. What I find so counter-intuitive about this rule is that the most common reason for seeking SNAP is because someone is losing a job, which is even more critical for those who have barriers to employment or who are already at the margins of the workforce.

As many experts have testified to Congress, the labor market experience of SNAP participants, as it is for so many low-paid workers, is highly unstable, and participants tend to cycle in and out of full-time employment.

This rule would cut food aid for between 755,000 and 821,000 individuals from red States, blue States, and purple States, and from rural, urban, and suburban communities, without any regard to the barriers they may face or the fact that they may live in areas or ZIP Codes or Census tracts that lack jobs, or that companies are moving, or other unanticipated egresses from the workforce.

No matter what people say, there are still pockets of high unemployment rates well above the national average. This body must make crystal clear that we support the vulnerable population of able-bodied adults who are being targeted here and that increasing hunger does not increase employability. It does not create new jobs in rural or other areas with high unemployment. It doesn't remove barriers to employment. It just simply increases hunger.

While there are so many good things in this package that will help to attack hunger and food insecurity, I am deeply disappointed that we are missing the opportunity to use Congress' title I power to block this rule. Let's not go down as the did-nothing Congress when it comes to something so common sense as providing food for the most vulnerable.

I am so concerned about this rule's impact on truly vulnerable individuals. Let's not be fooled because we are calling them "able-bodied." These folks have challenges that make finding work difficult. This includes veterans, homeless people, children who have aged out of foster care, and college students.

The vast majority of SNAP participants affected by this proposal live in deep poverty, with 88 percent of households at or below 50 percent of the poverty level.

Madam Chair, 1 in 10 are working, although less than an average of 20 hours a week. One study found that 75 percent participate in the workforce. Of

those who do work but sometimes do not, the majority don't work due to their having lost a job or they couldn't get enough hours. This rule would do nothing to address those issues.

Of those who are not in the labor force, 80 percent of them said that it was due to health and disability. This rule would do nothing to address those issues.

I am also concerned about the impact on States. Despite all the wonderful claims of a strong economy, we continue to hear that all boats are not lifted, which is why the existing flexibility to protect people from hunger when jobs are simply not available in some areas is so critical.

Almost every State has used this flexibility under the existing waiver at some point, including some of the most conservative States. If someone claims to support States' rights, that Governors and local elected officials know best about what is going on in their States, especially where we know economic conditions can vary from county to county, city to city, even ZIP Code to ZIP Code, then you should be opposed to this rule.

Punishing poor people will not help them get jobs.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Chairwoman LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COURNEY). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise to speak about the fiscal year 2020 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member of the full committee and also my ranking member, Mr. JOYCE, for all of his collaboration.

I want people to know that this bill is the proud work, hard work, and collaboration of our subcommittee, which held 16 hearings. We received over 6,000 requests from Members of Congress, and we worked hard to make a bill that reflected the priorities of the entire House.

I also want to note that this bill makes critical investments for the American people and for our planet. It does that because the subcommittee had a recommended total of \$37.3 billion in discretionary funding. That is an increase of \$1.7 billion over last year.

We also were able to include this year, because of hard work by the subcommittee led by Mr. SIMPSON last year, an additional \$2.25 billion in fire cap adjusted funds for suppression operations. That is really important for the Forest Service in order to fight wildland fires without borrowing from nonfire programs.

Some of the biggest increases in this bill, however, honor our Federal and treaty trust responsibilities to provide for the health, safety, and education of our Native American brothers and sisters.

Mr. JOYCE and I, Mr. Chair, worked on this in a very nonpartisan fashion with the entire subcommittee. We can be proud that this bill continues to move us in the right direction in honoring our treaty and trust obligations.

In fact, this bill invests over \$10 billion to support and strengthen Tribal self-determination, including \$1 billion, the highest ever recommended, for the operation of Native American education programs. As I said, Mr. Chair we did that together in the subcommittee in a nonpartisan way.

For many other agencies in this bill, however, the Trump administration had devastating cuts.

The President's request was a 31 percent cut to the Environmental Protection Agency, and that cut would have prevented the EPA from its mission to keep our communities safe and healthy.

In fact, under President Trump's watch, yesterday, the administration rolled out what many of us call its dirty power plan. We have evidence from the scientific community to say that it could contribute up to 1,400 premature deaths annually.

Democrats are fighting back on this bill with important investments to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink. We boost support for the EPA's Clean Air Markets programs by \$25.6 million, and we increase congressional oversight to make sure that there aren't any rollbacks attempted to put the public health at risk.

We also fund the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund at the authorized level, and we target resources needed to address drinking and wastewater needs.

This bill also takes a huge step forward in building on what was started in the Defense bill that we voted on earlier this week to address the crisis of PFOS, which is contaminating our water.

I am very proud that, after the President signed a bipartisan bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund even though the President zeroed it out in his budget, we chose to invest \$524 million in LWCF.

I would like to conclude by talking about climate change for a second. As we know, the administration has cut everywhere it can to decimate Federal funding to do research and combat and adapt to climate change. Our bill does the opposite. It boosts funding for climate change research, tracking and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions, and energy and water efficiency programs in the EPA. The U.S. Geological Survey has its role to play on climate, and we support that. It also restores very important programs on this that were eliminated in the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This bill recognizes the importance of science to understand the impacts of climate change in our natural and cultural resources, in our ecosystems, and in human health.

It is a good bill, and I think as we go through it, Mr. Chair, and listen to the amendments we can make a good bill even better.

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

□ 1300

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 126, 138, 141, 142, 152, 153, 155, 159, 160, 164, 169, 170, 171, 172, 175, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 192, and 193 printed in part B of House Report 116-119, offered by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota:

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. SCANLON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000)”.

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 138 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE OF COLORADO

Page 288, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$3,000,000) (increased by \$3,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 141 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA OF ARIZONA

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the transfer of jurisdiction over border lands pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 9844 (Feb. 15, 2019).

AMENDMENT NO. 142 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA OF ARIZONA

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13817 (82 Fed. Reg. 60835) with respect to uranium.

AMENDMENT NO. 152 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to accept a nomination for oil and gas leasing under 43 CFR 3120.3 et seq, or to offer for oil and gas leasing, any federal lands within the withdrawal area identified on the map of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park prepared by the Bureau of Land Management and dated April 2, 2019.

AMENDMENT NO. 153 OFFERED BY MR. LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

Page 217, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,500,000) (reduced by \$1,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 155 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI OF OREGON

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 159 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act

may be used to increase the generation of water bottle waste.

AMENDMENT NO. 160 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act may be used for the purchase or display of a Confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances where the flags provide historical context as described in the National Park Service memorandum entitled “Immediate Action Required, No Reply Needed: Confederate Flags” and dated June 24, 2015.

AMENDMENT NO. 164 OFFERED BY MR. LOVENTHAL OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a proposed or final rule to replace the Consolidated Federal Oil & Gas and Federal & Indian Coal Valuation Reform final rule, published in the Federal Register on July 1, 2016 (81 FR 43338).

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. VARGAS OF CALIFORNIA

Page 299, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000) (reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 170 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER OF VIRGINIA

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled “Review of Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units” published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on December 20, 2018 (83 Fed. Reg. 65424).

AMENDMENT NO. 171 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER OF VIRGINIA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or relocate any office of the Environmental Protection Agency that houses emergency responders or a criminal investigation unit.

AMENDMENT NO. 175 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$25,000) (reduced by \$25,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 177 OFFERED BY MR. HORSFORD OF NEVADA

Page 234, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 234, line 5, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 178 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN OF VIRGINIA

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for a Department of the Interior Executive Resources Board whose voting members are comprised of less than 50 percent career Senior Executive Service members.

AMENDMENT NO. 180 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 310, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 310, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 181 OFFERED BY MR. O’HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 291, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act to the United States Geological Survey may be used to limit the use of climate modeling tools.

AMENDMENT NO. 182 OFFERED BY MS. STEVENS OF MICHIGAN

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$2,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 183 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or relocate any EPA offices in regions that contain one or more designated Sulfur Dioxide (2010) Nonattainment Areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the amendments included in the en bloc were made in order under the rule. I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment in the en bloc.

Mr. Chairman, my district is home to Chester, an economically distressed, majority Black city that has struggled for generations. As a result, major polluting industries have set up shop in Chester next to schools, hospitals, homes, and businesses. One of these polluters, a large municipal waste incinerator, was featured on a CNN report that aired just this week.

All day every day my constituents are breathing in carcinogens released by the incinerator like mercury, cadmium, and particulate matter that prevent them from working, learning, and leading healthy lives. At the same time, the Trump administration has failed to enforce Clean Air Act standards that could protect these citizens.

Fortunately, our Interior appropriations bill ensures that Clean Air Act enforcement is a priority, but this amendment makes clear that the administration cannot take these underserved communities like Chester for granted.

This Congress will not allow environmental injustice to go unchecked. We will fight for our constituents, and we will take meaningful steps to address the public health and environmental justice crises that lack of EPA enforcement has fostered.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the Democratic en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment includes language which would take a major step back in unleashing our domestic potential to procure critical minerals and reduce our reliance on foreign competitors like China and Russia. The amendment also includes language which would limit access to the healthiest beverage option in our national parks—water.

Should we limit drinking water options available to park visitors especially in parks where the temperatures can easily reach triple digits?

The answer is no.

Finally, I offer a few observations that I believe we should keep in mind as we discuss ethylene oxide. Ethylene oxide is a critical tool to ensure that medical devices are sterile and safe for patients. For many materials, that is certain plastics, ethylene oxide is the only safe option for sterilization. Other sterilization methods—radiation and steam heat—will degrade the materials and cause the device to lose its integrity.

We all share the goal of patient access to safe medical devices, clean air, and clean workspaces. I am committed to working with my colleague and others to encourage more sustainable and efficient use of EO.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment which includes an amendment I offered to increase funding for the Environmental Protection Agency’s Science Advisory Board to review the strengthening transparency in regulatory science—or so-called secret science—proposed rule and decrease funding for the EPA Administrator’s executive management account.

I thank Chair McCOLLUM for her leadership in increasing funding for the EPA’s Science Advisory Board in the underlying bill.

As a cornerstone of its regulatory process, the EPA relies on peer-reviewed science. Unfortunately, the proposed strengthening transparency in regulatory science rule would preclude the use of the best available science. The rule undermines scientific integrity, jeopardizes bedrock public health and environmental standards, and endangers the EPA’s ability to fulfill its mission. It would impede, if not eradicate, the agency’s work to protect Americans from significant risks to human health and the environment.

Not surprisingly, the EPA ignored science when developing this proposed rule. The EPA failed to consult with their own Office of the Science Advisor, and they limited the Science Advisory Board in the scope of the board’s review.

The proposed rule would have chilling consequences for the EPA and for every person who benefits from clean air and clean water. This amendment will direct the Science Advisory Board to provide a comprehensive review of the entire proposed rule before it is finalized. We must defend science.

I, again, thank Chair McCOLLUM and also Representatives TONKO, SHERRILL, and FLETCHER for their support, and I urge the Congress to support the en bloc amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the en bloc amendment which contains an amendment I have offered.

In order to ensure the Environmental Protection Agency is able to effectively carry out its responsibility to protect human health and the environment for future generations, we need to ensure emergency responders and investigators are there when we need them.

Closing EPA’s facilities or relocating personnel tasked with the ultimate responsibility to answer the call during an environmental emergency or investigate the cost and whom to hold accountable in the aftermath is the wrong approach. Future generations will be less safe, and the health of our environment will be at increased risk.

This amendment would simply prevent the EPA from closing or relocating any office or facility that houses either emergency responders or a criminal investigation unit responsible for carrying out the agency’s mission.

EPA emergency response personnel serve in offices—some large and some small—across this Nation. These brave and dedicated public servants respond to oil spills; chemical, biological, and radiological releases; and large-scale national emergencies. They also provide additional response assistance when State and local first responder capabilities have been exhausted or need additional support.

Located in my district is the Large Lakes Research Station on Grosse Ile, an island in the Detroit River. This facility serves the Great Lakes region.

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment and to offer my environmental justice amendment to H.R. 3055.

This amendment would require that the EPA identify 100 communities across the country that are suffering from especially egregious violations of environmental law and clean them up. It would require the EPA to study what

happens when communities experience multiple sources of pollution and then come up with better ways to protect them going forward. The amendment has one simple goal, to ensure that every American has clean air to breath, safe water to drink, and access to food that is free of toxins.

While the goal may sound simple, the harsh reality is that we as a nation have been failing to provide these staples of life to too many communities for far too long. When we fail to protect our environment, it is often the poorest among us who suffer the most. When we allow pipes to become contaminated or when we allow companies to spew more toxins into the air, it is usually lower income communities and communities of color that get hurt the most. This amendment is for them.

These communities include communities like Elyria Swansea and neighboring Globeville which are neighborhoods in the northern part of my district.

The people in these communities experience a wide range of health problems on a daily basis, like throat irritation and watery eyes, which are likely linked to their constant exposure to a long list of toxins in the air. Whether it is hydrogen cyanide, whether it is other kinds of waste or smog-causing pollutants, these people suffer every day.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to support my amendment and let these communities be remedied.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, apparently there is an individual who is en route who would like to speak on this amendment, but at this point in time I do not have a witness right here, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055. Ethylene oxide—also known as ETO—is an industrial chemical used to sterilize medical equipment and manufacture products like anti-freeze.

We have known for decades that ETO is dangerous, and in 2016, EPA listed it as a known carcinogen.

Dozens of facilities around the country—including two in my district in—use and emit ETO into the surrounding communities. My constituents in Waukegan and Gurnee are rightly concerned about the local levels of ETO and any possible health consequences.

When our neighbors in Willowbrook, Illinois faced similar questions about ETO, the EPA's community engagement provided vital data to inform residents about the public health risk they face, and the steps they were taking to mitigate the threat.

But the EPA has left dozens of communities around the country, including my constituents, in the dark. These are localities that we know face high ETO levels, yet the EPA refuses to hold public forums to answer our community's urgent questions.

Every American should have confidence in the safety of the air that they and their families breathe. The EPA needs to do its job and engage with communities where that assurance is under threat.

This amendment would set aside \$25,000 for EPA public engagement on ethylene oxide to communities identified in the National Air Toxic Assessment to face dangerous emissions levels of this known carcinogen. This is a small sum, but one that would have a big effect on the families living in these communities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, my amendment would limit the Administration's ability to co-opt important public lands for an unnecessary, hateful, and expensive wall at our Southern border—my home region.

This amendment would defund Section 2 of the President's National Emergency Declaration by barring agencies from using the funds appropriated in this bill to turn parks, wildlife refuges, and other public lands into a militarized border zone administered by agencies lacking the expertise to take good care of them.

Our border lands are comprised of a diverse array of ecosystems that support over 100 different endangered or threatened species, per a 2016 Fish and Wildlife Service report.

The border wall would fragment important habitats, limiting the ability of animals to find food, water, and potential mates across their range.

We always need to be conscientious of the ways that any major federal project affects our natural world. But when the project is so hateful and useless, and when it impacts such vulnerable ecological communities, we must do something.

I refuse to stand by while our President abuses his powers to remove jurisdiction over our public lands from the agencies best able to take care of them. They are our heritage, not an expendable construction zone.

Trump's border wall is unnecessary, harmful and ineffective. Border communities remain some of the safest cities in the country, yet the continued militarization of our borderlands continues hurting border communities, commerce, and wildlife.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is currently exempt from all local, state and federal laws that exist to protect the environment, wildlife, historic and archaeological sites, Native American sacred sites, and religious practices—all of which negatively impact the borderlands.

More walls will not affect the flow of drugs into the country; instead we must modernize and invest in our crumbling infrastructure and ensure adequate staffing at our ports of entry.

I would like to thank the Chair and the committee for their work on this bill. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, and I would urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

We must stop the false narrative of a violent and insecure border to justify border wall construction.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prevent uranium from being considered as a critical mineral under the Trump Administration's critical mineral strategy.

Last year, the Interior Department included uranium on a list of critical minerals required under Executive Order 13817.

However, uranium does not meet the definition of a "critical mineral" in that executive order.

Under the order, the first criteria for a critical mineral is that it must be a "non-fuel mineral" or a "mineral material."

Uranium is neither.

Even the Department of the Interior understands that.

Earlier this month at a Natural Resources Committee hearing on my Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, a senior official from the Department testified that, "Uranium, like oil and gas, solar, wind, geothermal, and other energy sources, remains a vital component of a responsible and comprehensive energy strategy."

Clearly, uranium is a fuel mineral, so it fails to meet that part of the critical mineral definition.

And a "mineral material" is defined by the Minerals Act of 1947 as common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and other similar items.

The Bureau of Land Management also clearly tells people on their website that mineral materials are sold and not subject to the Mining Law of 1872.

Uranium, on the other hand, is subject to the Mining Law of 1872, and it is not a "common variety" of anything by any stretch of the imagination.

So uranium fails that test as well.

We don't even have to get into the fact that our supply chain for uranium comes mainly from friendly countries like Canada and Australia, and is not at risk.

Uranium very clearly does not meet the definition of a "critical mineral" under the executive order.

Yet it is on the list of critical minerals published by the Interior Department last year, and subject to all the production enhancements and incentives recommended by the Department of Commerce in its Critical Mineral Strategy.

We do not need to make it any easier to mine uranium in this country.

Already mining companies in the United States have a sweetheart deal in the form of the Mining Law of 1872, where they pay no royalties and have virtually unfettered access to public lands.

The administration has already taken unprecedented steps that help out the uranium industry, such as cutting Bears Ears National Monument by 85 percent at their request.

Now the new critical mineral strategy recommends reviewing existing mineral withdrawals with an eye towards eliminating or shrinking them, particularly in areas where they may be critical minerals.

Because uranium is incorrectly defined as a critical mineral, this puts the Grand Canyon right in the crosshairs.

The Obama administration put a 20-year withdrawal on the sensitive lands around the Grand Canyon so it could study the impacts of uranium mining in the region.

We are less than half of the way into that withdrawal, but the uranium companies are salivating at the possibility of ending those protections early and descending on uranium deposits around the Grand Canyon.

My Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act would protect this landscape and the residents who have called it home for centuries. Unfortunately, we may never get the chance to do this if President Trump continues to do the bidding of the uranium mining companies.

Given the legacy of uranium mining in the West, particularly the terrible health impacts experienced on the Navajo Nation from abandoned uranium mines, we should be holding

mining companies accountable, not handing them a blank check to more of our most special public lands.

That's why this amendment is so important. It prohibits the administration from treating uranium as a critical mineral and using the actions identified in the Commerce Department's Critical Mineral Strategy in order to grease the skids for new uranium mines.

It doesn't affect any of the other minerals on the critical minerals list, and it doesn't prevent companies from staking new uranium claims or opening new uranium mines.

It just keeps the government from giving those companies any additional benefits beyond the too many that they already have.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 127 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 128 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas for the South Atlantic, the Straits of Florida, and the areas of the Central and Eastern Gulf of Mexico described by section 104(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect the coastlines of Florida from the scourge of offshore oil drilling.

I am proud to say that this amendment, as we will see this morning from my colleagues' comments, has strong bipartisan support from our colleagues in the Florida delegation.

When it comes to the idea of turning our beaches into a fossil fuel industrial zone, there is no divergence between Democrats and Republicans in Florida. We stand united to prevent drilling off of our cherished coasts. Florida's famous beaches are central to our \$65 billion a year tourism industry. Our hotels, fishermen, and recreation industries depend on clean coastal waters, and the still recovering Florida Bay cannot afford an oil spill.

Every time I speak about this issue, I make sure to mention the Deepwater Horizon disaster. Apparently, the current administration has already forgotten what happened to us 9 years ago. At its worst, the spill leaked more than 60,000 barrels of oil a day. Eighty-seven days went by while crude gushed into the ocean nearly unchecked. By its end, millions of barrels of crude oil were released into the Gulf of Mexico.

This devastated the entire Gulf ecosystem. Thousands of protected species were harmed by oil slicks and dead zones. Coral reefs between Alabama and Florida were decimated and suffocated by oil, and hydrocarbons were found on hundreds of miles of beaches around the Gulf.

This environmental impact also left a human toll. The accident caused the deaths of 11 rig workers. The spill left 12,000 people unemployed and decimated local economies which rely on fishing and marine recreation.

□ 1315

Now is not the time to expand more areas to fossil fuel extraction. We must be doing everything possible to transition to a clean energy economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), my friend and the former Governor of our great State.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Florida, Representative DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her leadership on this important issue and for working with me and the Florida delegation to include banning drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico in this amendment.

I represent most of Pinellas County, Florida, on the Gulf Coast. My district is surrounded by water on three sides. It is virtually a peninsula. As you can imagine, this issue is deeply important to me, my constituents, and all Floridians.

I was Governor of Florida when the Deepwater Horizon exploded in 2010. I saw the tar balls wash up along Florida beaches. I saw the harm done to Florida's economy and our way of life. I have seen firsthand the consequences of offshore oil drilling. I hope to never see it again.

We must protect the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the environmental, economic, and national security benefits it provides to the region and to the United States of America. I could not be more proud that the Florida delegation stands united to do exactly that.

I urge passage of this amendment and the underlying legislation.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from southwest Florida (Mr. ROONEY), who represents the great counties of Collier and Lee.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from the east

coast of Florida, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for her courageous leadership on this issue and join and echo what the Governor said as we continue to work together to fight the scourge of offshore drilling.

Offshore drilling anywhere near Florida represents an existential threat to our tourist and recreation economy that we cannot risk taking.

We also have the important military bases all along the Gulf Coast that the Governor referred to that are equally important that use the Gulf as offshore testing grounds. This is the only place in the world where our United States Navy and Air Force can conduct these tests.

I want to thank Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for her leadership and to urge adoption of this amendment and protect Florida. Twenty-one million people are being protected by Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, before I yield the remaining time to Mr. RUTHERFORD from Jacksonville, I include in the RECORD this letter from the Florida delegation opposing offshore oil drilling that was sent to Secretary Bernhardt.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.
Re Protect Florida's Coasts from Oil and Gas Drilling.

DAVID BERNHARDT,
Acting Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR ACTING INTERIOR SECRETARY BERNHARDT: We write to urge you to protect the coasts of Florida from oil and gas development. As you know, last year, former Interior Secretary Zinke announced that Florida would be exempt from any offshore drilling plans. However, we remain concerned that no formal action has been taken to prohibit drilling off Florida's coasts. Florida's natural resources and economy, as well as the military mission as expressed by the Department of Defense, cannot bear the risk and devastating impacts of offshore drilling. We urge you to take formal action to exempt drilling off Florida's coast from the five year plan for oil and gas lease sales.

Florida's economic well-being is dependent upon our state's fragile and treasured coasts. Clean coasts and healthy oceans are the fundamental underpinning of jobs and revenue in our communities. Florida's coastal communities thrive in concert with a healthy marine environment. Views littered with drilling platforms, industrialization of coastline and oil on our beaches spell disaster for Florida's economy and our neighbors who rely on tourism, fishing and related business.

We saw, firsthand, the destruction offshore drilling can have on ocean health, coastlines, and tourism in 2010 during the Deepwater Horizon disaster. Tourism dropped across the state, including areas that were unaffected by the rig explosion. Even without a blowout, offshore oil rigs dump tons of drilling muds, fluids, and metal cuttings—including toxic metals and carcinogens—into the ocean, and pose a threat to human health, marine ecosystems, and wildlife.

While there are ample environmental and economic reasons to prohibit drilling off Florida's coasts, our national security and military readiness also require keeping the rigs away from Florida. The eastern Gulf of Mexico is a critical training area for our military and the Department of Defense has

stated clearly that the area is an “irreplaceable national asset” for combat force readiness. Any oil and gas development would be an obstacle to military preparedness and national security.

Finally, the people of Florida are also clearly opposed to oil and gas development off our coast. A constitutional amendment on Florida’s November 2018 ballot to ban offshore drilling in state waters passed overwhelmingly. Here is objective proof that Floridians recognize that the state’s economy depends on a pristine environment, and that offshore drilling threatens Florida’s future.

Florida relies on coastlines unencumbered by oil and gas drilling to sustain its economy, preserve its natural resources, and protect our nation’s military. We urge you to exempt Florida’s coasts from any offshore drilling plans. We must preserve and protect Florida’s future.

Sincerely,

Kathy Castor, Member of Congress; Frederica S. Wilson, Member of Congress; Donna E. Shalala, Member of Congress; Bill Posey, Member of Congress; Francis Rooney, Member of Congress; Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Member of Congress; Charlie Crist, Member of Congress; Matt Gaetz, Member of Congress; Ted S. Yoho, D.V.M., Member of Congress; Alcee L. Hastings, Member of Congress; Gus M. Bilirakis, Member of Congress; Brian J. Mast, Member of Congress; Stephanie Murphy, Member of Congress; Theodore E. Deutch, Member of Congress; Daniel Webster, Member of Congress; Mario Diaz-Balart, Member of Congress; Debbie Mucarsel-Powell, Member of Congress; Al Lawson, Jr., Member of Congress; Lois Frankel, Member of Congress; Darren Soto, Member of Congress; Val Butler Demings, Member of Congress; John H. Rutherford, Member of Congress; Vern Buchanan, Member of Congress; W. Gregory Steube, Member of Congress; Neal P. Dunn, M.D., Member of Congress; Michael Waltz, Member of Congress; Ross Spano, Member of Congress.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Jacksonville, Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from south Florida for, as was mentioned earlier, having the courage to stand up for our State and protect it from the scourge of drilling.

I have to tell you, just last November, Mr. Chair, 69 percent of Florida voters supported banning drilling in the State waters off of Florida’s coast.

It is no secret that our Florida beaches and our oceans drive our economy. Drilling could affect not only our beautiful beaches and thriving tourism but, also, our national security.

I have met with Department of Defense officials multiple times, and they have continued to share serious concerns about how offshore drilling activities could impact their operations.

The eastern Gulf is a vital training ground for our military, and on Florida’s Atlantic Coast that I share with my colleague, we are home to Mayport, NAS Jax, and Kings Bay, just to name a few.

Mr. Chair, this important amendment will protect our coast, our economies, and our national defense. For all

these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this because I want to remind everybody this is continental offshore; this is not State-owned property. This is the property of the American public.

So, if we are going to extend that aspect, I want the same type of application to lands out in western Arizona and the Western United States. So we have to start looking at this.

We have seen opposition, basically, state that they can’t coexist: fundamental energy development, exploration, and tourism. But we see that very vibrantly in the Gulf State of Louisiana. We see one of the most vibrant fishing areas. The argument doesn’t hold muster in that regard.

In regards to that, we need to explore and find out exactly what kind of resources are actually there. It makes a big difference in regards to energy independence because those who spend money for tourism have to have a job, and plentiful energy at affordable prices help American businesses and the American worker.

So the same aspects we are trying to extend here for Florida should be extended all the way across the board.

But, once again, this is the public’s property. It needs to be well invested, and the government has the due diligence in which to do that.

We can take into consideration the concerns of the military. We do it time and time again in southwestern Arizona. We have the Goldwater Range, the Yuma Proving Ground, yet we still coexist with the natural resources and environmental protections.

I think, within that aspect, I rise in opposition, and I would ask everybody to defeat this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or enforce the regulation issued on March 21, 2011 at 40 CFR part 60 subparts CCCC and DDDD with respect to “small, remote incinerators” in the State of Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, in 2013, the EPA issued new standards on air pollutant emissions for commercial and industrial solid waste incineration, which include the small, remote incinerators used in remote Alaska.

My amendment would prohibit the EPA from enforcing these rules on small, remote incinerators in Alaska. My amendment would not affect anyone but Alaskans.

I know this Chamber has shown great interest in my State recently, but I sincerely hope you would agree that enforcing these rules in remote locations that are not even connected with the highway system is unjustified.

While I appreciate the focus on clean air, these standards are unattainable for rural Alaska. If the 2013 criteria are enforced in my State, residents and industry alike would be forced to be non-compliant or would not be able to use waste incinerators at all.

In many locations, there are very limited options for the handling and disposal of waste. The ground is frozen or the water table is too high. The locations that would be impacted by this rule are hundreds of miles away from waste facilities in Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks.

While garbage trucks are critical to the infrastructure of the lower 48, transporting waste from these remote sites would generate more emissions than burning near the sites.

When EPA wrote this rule, they used bad science and statistical methods to select the new standards. They didn’t use enough samples to have statistical confidence in the values, and two of the incinerator units they used in the emission data do not even qualify as “small” or “remote” areas. They were both located within 20 miles of a regional landfill.

Incineration is the cleanest, most environmentally sustainable way to deal with waste in small villages. One thousand pounds of waste can be reduced to 50 pounds of ash that can be safely transported.

Keep this in mind: We have a lot of small villages that can only have incinerators; they cannot have landfills without shipping it. I am talking about 400 or 500 people.

This is not a good idea. It is the wrong thing to do.

I will say again, Alaska is a little unique. We are just about half as big as the United States, with 750,000 people. To put this standard in place, making these people, frankly, break the law is wrong. This amendment would keep them from applying that to the standards.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would exempt certain small incinerators in Alaska from being regulated under the Clean Air Act.

My good friend knows that this amendment is fundamentally different from what was done in the 2019 bill. That language barred incinerator rules adopted in 2011 from being enforced but left in place the pre-2011 rules governing those facilities.

This amendment would bar enforcement of any Clean Air Act rule, and, for me, that is unacceptable.

These incinerators, as the gentleman pointed out, are currently burning, but what they are releasing is some of the most noxious air emissions in the country, some of the most grievous.

It is critical that we ensure that we are complying with clean air regulations. There have to be some rules to this.

We have an obligation to protect the health and safety of all Americans, and exempting incinerators in the way that this language is currently written, for even small and remote ones, from the Clean Air Act regulations is just something I can't accept at this time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments, but, again, what do you do with a town that has 500 people and the only way to dispose of waste is by burning it or letting it go on the turf, letting it blow around, letting it pollute the other parts of the Earth? This is the only sensible way to do it.

I am not talking about great big cities. I am talking about small communities that cannot have landfills. And that does occur.

We don't have that many in Alaska, but where they do have these incinerators, there ought to be some compliance in the sense that: Okay, guys, you are not really polluting the air. It is a better way. There is more environmental damage by not being able to bury it, letting it run around on the top of the surface of the Earth, than there is burning it.

I know I just came out of Denmark. They have one of the largest incinerators in the world. It handles 2 million people. They burn 35 tons an hour.

Now, I am saying, okay, let's have those kind of incinerators, but you can't afford it for a small village.

Mr. Chair, I know where the gentlewoman is coming from, but you can't apply all rules to every place at one time when it doesn't work. You have to look at the total environmental damage.

I think, if you don't burn it, you have a lot harder problem than you do if you do burn it, so I urge my colleagues to support this small, innocuous amendment to try to make people live a better way than having them forced by a government agency to a standard that can't be met unless they just let it run around on the top of the ground.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as I said, I understand the gentleman's concerns, but the fact is that this is fundamentally different from what we did in the FY20 bill in working with the lead Senator from Alaska, who is the counterpart on the Interior appropriations.

This just goes too far. So, I oppose this as it is currently written, and I can't go just supporting this, because it completely, completely eliminates the Clean Air Act rules.

I offer the gentleman an opportunity to go in front of the authorizing committee, and, at that point, if he wants to talk some more and we can figure out a way to create a win-win, I would be happy to help him in the authorizing committee; but I cannot support this amendment as it stands, eliminating the rules for clean air, at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendments No. 130 and 131 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 132 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 132 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, or the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1330

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to block oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic Ocean. My amendment is steeped in bipartisan tradition. For 27 years, start-

ing in 1982, Congress continuously supported an Atlantic oil and gas drilling moratorium.

We cannot take the greatest resource of our coastal communities and economies for granted, which is why, today, we must act to restore the bipartisan language that would protect the Atlantic Coast from drilling.

The Trump administration's misguided effort to drill in the Atlantic is reckless, in my opinion. Simply put, the vitality of our coastal economies is tied to healthy ocean ecosystems. Healthy oceans along the East Coast support billions in gross domestic product and more than a million jobs through fishing, recreation, and tourism alone.

In my home State of New Jersey, the tourism industry generates \$44 billion a year and supports over half a million jobs. This will no longer be the case if the beautiful beaches of the Jersey shore are slicked with oil.

The bipartisan cosponsors of this amendment and the communities we represent are unwilling to accept the tremendous risks that come with oil and gas drilling in the Atlantic. Hundreds of local governments have passed formal resolutions opposing oil and gas exploration and drilling in the Atlantic, as have numerous local chambers of commerce, tourism and restaurant associations, and commercial and recreational fishing associations.

More than 43,000 businesses and 500,000 commercial fishing families have joined together to strongly oppose offshore oil and gas exploration and drilling.

Mr. Chair, ocean health is already strained by too much trash, rising sea temperatures, and acidification due to climate change. Our oceans and our economies can't afford the risks of dangerous oil and gas development.

More than 4 million gallons of oil have been spilled or leaked in the Pacific Ocean since 1969. Again, the unimaginable risk to our shores is not worth making wealthy oil and gas companies richer.

In 2010, the BP Deepwater Horizon disaster caused a 10-year projected economic loss of \$8.7 billion in fisheries from Texas to Florida, including 22,000 lost jobs.

There is no hiding behind State lines from oil spills. The only way to protect ourselves is a full Atlantic moratorium and a commonsense return to historic bipartisan precedent.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. This amendment I am speaking in opposition to is actually shortsighted.

We have been producing oil and gas offshore all over the country on the Outer Continental Shelf for a very long time. We can do it safely.

I believe the ones who don't want to see the areas mentioned in this amendment opened up for offshore leasing really just don't want fossil fuel development.

We are in an energy renaissance in this country where we are finding more oil and gas, to the point that we are now a net exporter of oil and a net exporter of gas. That means we are producing more in this country than we are using in this country, so we have a surplus. We are able to help our friends and allies around the world, in Europe, to lessen their dependence on Russian gas.

Shutting down the opportunity to explore on the Outer Continental Shelf in these areas is really not wanting to find out what is out there. What harm does it do to look, to begin the seismic work, to find out what may be off the coast of the great State of South Carolina?

Recently, they just found, off the coast of Suriname and Guyana, 32 trillion cubic feet of natural gas by using 21st-century, 3D seismic technology. If we allowed the seismic work to happen in these areas that y'all are wanting to exclude from energy exploration, we might find 32 trillion, 50 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Then the Southeast is playing in the energy renaissance in this country.

I think this is shortsighted. What harm does it do to look, to allow these areas to be opened for exploration and then, ultimately, production to help meet the energy needs of this Nation and others around the world going forward?

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

I appreciate the comments that the gentleman from South Carolina made. I don't mean to speak for his State, but I have to say, I was in Savannah and then went for a couple of days over to Saint Helena island, Hilton Head, and some of the areas where the Gullah people are. On another occasion, in May, I was in Charleston, and I went to James Island and a few other places.

I find it very hard to believe that the people who live in those coastal areas don't share the same concerns that we have in New Jersey about the impact of an oil spill on our tourism and recreational fishing industry.

Again, I am not going to speak for the gentleman's State because that wouldn't be proper.

But let me say this: When my colleague on the other side says that we can drill safely, I have to disagree.

When we had the BP spill 9 years ago, there was a bipartisan commission that was set up, and they made certain recommendations about drilling. Those recommendations were not followed by the Republican leadership in Congress.

The fact of the matter is that the BP spill was in relatively shallow water, compared to the type of drilling that is proposed off the coast of the Atlantic. What is happening is that, as we go further and further off the Outer Continental Shelf, the possibility of spills and the inability to take proper safety precautions become even more of a problem.

That was what the BP commission recommended. They pointed out that as we go deeper out, the technology doesn't exist to protect the coastal areas from a spill.

So I have to take issue with the gentleman. I would point out that the recommendations of the BP commission were never met.

I ask my colleagues to stand united by voting in favor of protecting the health and economic vitality of the coastal communities of all 14 States along the Atlantic Coast and the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I have seen, in the Natural Resources Committee, when I was there years ago, where fear tactics were used, saying that whales and other sea mammals, dolphins, would be killed because of the seismic work.

We had the chief biologist from BOEM say not a single marine mammal has ever been harmed in the exploration and seismic work that we have done all over the globe, off the coast of the Falklands, in the Mediterranean, off the coast of Africa. These fear tactics of oil spills and things are just shortsighted on meeting our energy needs, and the gentleman from Arizona gets that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, the irony of this aspect, to explore something that is of the public nature of the people of the United States, the ironic aspect is unfathomable.

To look at seismic, we don't even want to do seismic. We need seismic in regard to looking at moorings in regard to big wind. That is what we have seen over and over again, that this area wants to have big wind.

The other part to this aspect is, how does that work when you have to have a Russian tanker moored outside of your bay, which is one of the most easily spilled aspects of oil that you have to have for heating oil and natural gas in regard to heating your energy platforms in the areas? That is just unfathomable to me.

We do this better, and the technology is actually coming back around.

As the Western Caucus chairman, we went down to Houston to actually see the technology that exists. It is profound, absolutely profound what is there.

No one is asking to go past go, collect \$200. What they want to do is follow the rightful process in that aspect.

There is evidence like I cited in the Gulf States. Definitely when you look

at Louisiana, it is a plethora. It is one of the most diverse aquatic ecosystems around.

There is a way to have this and looking at it and benefit everybody.

Once again, the dichotomy of trying to separate one aspect of holdings for the American people, and then apply it to out West, where there is even more defined aspects of jurisdiction, to land aspects of public lands and public minerals and gas leases, is just ironic.

Mr. Chair, I remain in opposition.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment because I think it is shortsighted. There are States that want to play in the energy matrix. They want to play in the renaissance. They want to, hopefully, experience a 37.5 percent revenue-sharing back to the State.

Hopefully, they can experience the jobs that are created in the oil and gas industry that is an economic boom, not only for the State coffers through tax revenue but also with the jobs that are created in those communities.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 133 OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 133 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a permit for the import of a sport-hunted trophy of an elephant or lion taken in Tanzania, Zimbabwe, or Zambia. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment. For my constituents and my area, it is very important to them.

The amendment would prohibit permits for hunting and killing endangered lions and elephants for trophies in various countries in Africa—Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Tanzania.

Both the African elephant and lion are endangered species on the verge of extinction. We have seen lion populations decline by 50 percent in the past decade. In Tanzania, the elephant population declined by 60 percent between 2009 and 2014.

This amendment is critical to help ensure these creatures do not become extinct. President Trump has called elephant hunting a “horror show.”

There is no scientific evidence to support the claim that trophy hunting aids in helping to manage the population of these animals. If this were the case, we would see an increase in the species, not a dramatic decline of the elephant and lion populations.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Sport hunting is an important recreational activity for countless Americans and has been for centuries. President Teddy Roosevelt, a champion of the conservation movement, went on hunting expeditions around the world.

This amendment would negatively impact the people of Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Tanzania. The money generated from trophy hunts helps the local populations by providing jobs and funding for community services.

One of the countries listed in the amendment is Zimbabwe. The Communal Areas Management Plan for Indigenous Resources, or CAMPFIRE, program in Zimbabwe attempted to create economic incentives for communities and landowners to conduct habitat and ecosystem restoration. At one point, CAMPFIRE generated more than \$20 million, of which almost 90 percent came from trophy hunting, allowing communities to establish management over the habit and resources within the range area.

Another country mentioned in the amendment is Zambia. Zambia's Administrative Design for Game Management Areas program has served as a model for locally accruing trophy-hunting revenue, as the program receives 67 percent of the trophy-hunting revenue in game management areas. Fifty-three percent of the program revenue is directed toward wildlife management. The remainder goes to community development.

There is also a lack of sufficient data on the effect of hunting species that would lead us to support efforts like this amendment. According to the non-partisan Congressional Research Service, many scientific studies on trophy hunting's effects on wildlife populations contain disclaimers of insufficient data to measure the effect of hunting on a species.

Certainly, improvements can be made in these and other countries to further conserve species and benefit

local communities. However, this amendment would take us in the wrong direction. Instead, we should focus our efforts on habitat loss and fragmentation, illegal poaching, and conflict with humans.

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

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my co-chair of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus.

□ 1345

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate his leadership on this.

Sadly, invoking the memory of Teddy Roosevelt is not exactly the best symbol of conservation. He was one of the people that slaughtered thousands of buffalo and had trophy hunting around the world.

What is different today is that the scale is much greater, the populations we want to protect are dwindling.

At one point, we thought there was an inexhaustible supply of wild animals to kill. Even Teddy Roosevelt ended up supporting legislation to be able to protect endangered species, which he did in terms of the slaughter of wild birds.

We have seen these populations drop dramatically.

What trophy hunters do, they kill the strongest, the most magnificent animals, that if they are left in the population, would promote stronger herds of elephants and lions.

We are working against ourselves.

For a while here, the Federal Government took steps to limit the issuance of these permits, which as my friend Mr. BUCHANAN points out, even Donald Trump says is a horror show.

Now, I have been in Tanzania recently and looked at what happened on the ground. If you talk to those people there, their future is not slaughtering wildlife, it is protecting it.

The photo expeditions where they take the pictures and they don't kill them, that they reuse over and over and over again, is far more valuable and doesn't hurt the species.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully request that we approve the gentleman's amendment, that we stop this barbaric practice, that we not undermine the protection of these species, and do everything we can to reverse the horrific condition they have faced over the course of the last 20 years.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM), the chairwoman of the subcommittee.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, we should not be facilitating the hunting of species in countries that do not have good domestic conservation programs and have not demonstrated established, sound, science-based management programs.

The Interior bill recognizes the importance of these iconic species and the role they play in the ecosystem. It is imperative to conserve these species, especially in light of the recent UN report on biodiversity that warns us that 1 million species face extinction.

This amendment supports the committee's efforts to ensure the survival of elephants and lions for future and present generations. I support the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The misinformation you have just heard on the floor: You are not going to save any animals, you are going to help kill animals.

I have been to Africa eight times. I have tried to conserve, and I have done so. Areas that I have been hunting, like Namibia, the loss of the animals is because of poaching, not for the ivory, but because of the food, because there is no value to the animal, so they will kill it and eat it, the local people.

You are not going to help it out, because there is no value to that animal other than food if you don't have trophy hunting when it is worth more.

If I was to kill a buffalo over there, all I get is the head and the hide. They get the meat.

All you are going to do is prohibit it being imported into the United States and making you feel good, but it is not going to save the animal. In fact, the animal is going to diminish. That has been proven regardless of what you may read.

We are the real conservationists. It is going to let everybody else around the world go hunt in those areas, probably without any safeguard or investment.

This may sound good, it may help somebody out in their district, but it is not going to save the animals.

I suggest, respectfully, you ought to go and witness what is occurring over there by those that live there and are destroying the animals if we do not hunt them, because there is no value.

I believe I am a great conservationist. I have probably saved more animals than anyone in the room, because I do contribute.

You don't. You talk.

I think it is a shameful thing to say we are going to tell another country what they can and cannot do. That is what you are doing to make yourself feel good, but you are not saving the animals.

A conservationist is a true man that conserves, not tries to preserve in the natural state, because the natural state is very cruel. It takes the weak, it takes the strong, it takes them all. Man is the strongest of all, and they will take them all if it has no value other than food.

So I urge the defeat of this amendment. I wish more people would go and look and see, because you don't know what you are talking about.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the immediate past chairman of the Congressional Sportsman's Caucus, the largest bipartisan caucus in the United States Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, and I agree with what the gentleman from Alaska just said.

Hunters have conserved more acres and protected more animals all across the globe than many in this Chamber.

I realize we are an urban Nation, that we are having more representation from urban areas and we have gotten away from our days of hunting and fishing and understanding the role that the hunter plays in conservation, but, as the gentleman from Alaska said, we are going to tell other countries that they can't allow hunting because we are going to shut off the ability of the American hunter to bring certain trophies back.

These folks live with 5-ton animals that are damaging their crops, a whole season's worth of crops in one single night. Elephants are dangerous.

Ultimately, if you take the hunter out of that situation, the hunter is paying with his hard-earned dollars, not your tax dollars, his money.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM OF MINNESOTA

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 445, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 5 consisting of amendment Nos. 134, 137, 145, 146, 149, 150, 154, 157, 162, 166, 173, 174, 179, 183, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, and 191 printed in part B of House Report 116-119, offered by Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota:

AMENDMENT NO. 134 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Page 232, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 137 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT OF ARIZONA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 288, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 145 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 311, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)".

AMENDMENT NO. 146 OFFERED BY MS. MATSUI OF CALIFORNIA

Page 293, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 301, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000) (reduced by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 149 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 302, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 150 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE OF WISCONSIN

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 322, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 154 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA OF CALIFORNIA

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 157 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 258, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 267, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 162 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 166 OFFERED BY MR. RUIZ OF CALIFORNIA

Page 309, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000) (decreased by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 173 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

Page 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)".

Page 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$200,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 174 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 301, line 8, insert ", or any territory or possession of the United States" before the semicolon.

AMENDMENT NO. 179 OFFERED BY MR. O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 327, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 327, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 183 OFFERED BY MR. CASTEN OF ILLINOIS

Page 289, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)".

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MS. CRAIG OF MINNESOTA

Page 302, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000) (reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 185 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

Page 322, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$35,000,000) (reduced by \$35,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 186 OFFERED BY MS. HAALAND OF NEW MEXICO

Page 246, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$176,000,000) (reduced by \$176,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 188 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF MICHIGAN

Page 302, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 189 OFFERED BY MR. MCADAMS OF UTAH

Page 267, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1) (increased by \$1)".

AMENDMENT NO. 191 OFFERED BY MS. SHERRILL OF NEW JERSEY

Page 288, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000) (increased by \$8,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the amendments included in the en bloc have been made in order by the rule and have been agreed to by both sides.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendments and urge their adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman LOWEY for her support and Chair MCCOLLUM for working with us to include provisions important to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Included in this en bloc amendment are several water provisions that I support, including grants to States to reduce pollution in our waterways.

The amendment also supports the maintenance of the Great Lakes Advisory Board, which helps to ensure that transparent and credible views guide Great Lakes Restoration Initiative investments.

Finally, the en bloc amendment includes language prioritizing funding for grants to fight domestic violence in American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

Mr. Chair, I support the bipartisan en bloc amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Chair, the Great Lakes Advisory Board plays an essential role in providing the EPA with the technical, environmental, and local expertise needed to carry out the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

This board is one of over 1,000 advisory boards that operate across the Federal Government.

This past Friday, the Trump administration put all of those boards at risk by signing an executive order eliminating one-third of Federal advisory boards.

These boards provide technical expertise on topics as diverse as animal health, safe pesticide use, trade, and offer useful third-party review of scientific research conducted at Federal agencies.

The Trump administration order is, in a word, arbitrary, and it presents a clear threat to the ability of agencies to have the best information when making fundamental and far-reaching decisions.

While my amendment is specific to the Great Lakes Advisory Board, I have offered this amendment to underscore the importance of preserving funding for all of these boards.

The executive order is a mistake. It is another stunning escalation in this administration's war on science, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my distinguished colleague and friend.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM and Ranking Member JOYCE for working with me on this very important amendment.

In North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District, we are fortunate to have the Uwharrie National Forest. Throughout my time in Congress, I have heard horror stories from my constituents of the danger of the public roads within the Uwharrie National Forest.

I have seen these roads firsthand and can testify to the critical need of paving these roads.

My amendment works towards improving and maintaining these roads and assuring public access to this State treasure.

One of my constituents had a heart attack, and the ambulance couldn't get down the road because of the ruts and the washouts. Thankfully, the desperate, resourceful paramedics got out of the ambulance and sprinted down the road with a stretcher.

Another one of my constituents, their house burned to the ground because the road was so impassable, a firetruck couldn't get down to put out the blaze.

These are just a few of the examples of the severe public safety concerns that my constituents are facing due to the inability of the Park Service to maintain these roads.

It is unacceptable, and it is one reason why I have worked so hard to advocate on behalf of Uwharrie National Forest and advocate for more resources for the Park Service in general.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the Chief of the Forest Service, Ms. Christiansen, for her attention to this issue and for working with me to address this public safety crisis.

In addition, Mr. Chair, I want to, again, thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM for her work to increase funding for road construction in this legislation.

I will continue to work and stress the urgency of this issue until my constituents are safe. It is my duty as a Congressman to get this done.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as well as the en bloc.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), another Great Lakes State.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairwoman MCCOLLUM for her leadership in bringing forward a proposal that protects and preserves public lands, ensures access to clean air and drinking water, and combats climate change.

I am especially pleased to see this bill's \$90 million investment for the first time in Sewer Overflow Control Grants to control and treat sewer overflows and to help address the water infrastructure crisis our country faces.

My amendment prioritizes grant funding from Macomb County's Chapaton Retention Basin and other such sewer overflow systems that help protect the water sources our communities rely on every day. This funding will help make urgent water quality improvements to Lake St. Clair, to the Great Lakes, and to freshwater bodies all across our country.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank the former distinguished Member of this body and the current Macomb County Public Works Commissioner, Candice Miller, for her partnership to make sure we protect Lake St. Clair.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I want to thank the Appropriations Committee, and this one in particular, for the great work that the committee is doing.

I have had the privilege of doing amendments under the CJS, Agriculture, Interior, and let me express my appreciation for the added \$2 million for research in Historically Black Colleges, and particularly the opportunity for my amendment to enable NIFA to increase funding by \$2 million to the 1890 institutions, which are 19 HBCU land grants to support educational research.

It is so very important as it relates to food and agriculture, in particular, to make an increase so that the 1890 institutions can again be at the forefront of research. One of the schools in my area, Prairie View A&M, and Texas Southern University prepare the leaders for the agriculture industry of the future. So this legislation provides support for the many schools, such as Alabama A&M, Alcorn State University, Prairie View A&M, Fort Valley State University, Kentucky State University; and, of course, they enroll 40 percent of all African American students.

So I am grateful for this amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Chair's En Bloc Amendment, which includes Jackson Lee Amendment No. 91.

I wish to thank Chairman McGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE of the Rules Committee for making this Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member FORTENBERRY for their hard work in bringing Division B, the Agriculture and Related Agencies portion of this omnibus appropriations legislative package, to the floor.

Thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain my amendment.

The Jackson Lee amendment supports the work of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) by making a modest increase in funding to that office for the purpose of supporting agriculture research programs at 1890s Institutions, which are land grant colleges at 19 Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

NIFA works to improve our nation's food production through agricultural research, economic analysis, extension, and higher education.

The NIFA was created at the time of the industrial revolution to ensure that the nation would have a sufficient number of working farms to provide a reliable supply of domestically produced food.

One of ways NIFA achieves its mission is by providing research grants to education institutions, which include 1890s institutions created by the Morrill Act of 1890.

Today, land-grant colleges and universities can be found in 18 states, the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The list includes:

Alabama A&M University
Alcorn State University
Delaware State University
Florida A&M University
Fort Valley State University
Kentucky State University
Langston University
Lincoln University
North Carolina A&T State University
Prairie View A&M University in Texas
South Carolina State University
Southern University System
Tennessee State University
Tuskegee University
University of Arkansas Pine Bluff
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
University of the District of Columbia
University of the Virgin Islands
Virginia State University
West Virginia State University
HBCUs annually enroll 40 percent of all African American students in 4-year colleges and universities.

HBCUs are prominent among research institutions in fields such as:

animal sciences
sustainable agriculture and agriculture economics
toxicology and waste management
conservation and environmental management
business and industrial development
biomedical science
food and nutrition
plant and social sciences
international development

The demand for fresh fruits and vegetables as well as concerns for the distance food travels before they reach the tables in urban areas has led to the rise of urban farming.

HBCU agriculture research institutions are playing a significant role in bringing urban farming to communities of color.

HCBU's agricultural research programs also assist people living in densely populated areas to learn ways to eliminate food deserts, increase public education regarding farming, develop a greater appreciation for our nation's farmers, and provide new avenues for careers for those graduating with agriculture degrees seeking to enter into cutting edge agricultural research.

The funds provided by the Jackson Lee amendment would support research and education into means for helping urban and suburban communities maximize their green space by turning it into productive farming resources to support access to affordable foods.

The funding can also help to develop new research efforts directed at farming techniques for non-traditional farming space, such as those we are now seeing being developed for urban centers.

Adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment will benefit rural, suburban and urban areas by maximizing the potential for farming activity in areas where green space is limited, or land is underused.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman BISHOP and his colleagues on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for their work on this important legislation.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3055, which would provide funding for the 400 Years of African-American History Commission. I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOHN LEWIS, BARBARA LEE, and RASHIDA TLAIB for cosponsoring this amendment which would provide an additional \$500,000 to support the work of this important commission. I would also like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY, Chairwoman MCCOLLUM and the Appropriations Committee for working with me to include funding in the underlying bill and their support for this amendment.

The 400 Years of African American History Commission is charged with planning programs and activities to commemorate the arrival of the "twenty and odd" enslaved Africans who arrived at Point Comfort, Virginia 400 years ago this August and to recognize the influence and contributions of Africans in America in the 400 years since.

Unfortunately, that August day in 1619 was not the last time men, women, and children arrived to our country as slaves or were born into bondage here. The history of our nation cannot be fully understood or appreciated without knowing and acknowledging their stories and understanding the ramifications of slavery. We must not ever allow ourselves to forget that this country, including our nation's Capitol, was built through the forced labor of enslaved Africans and their descendants.

More than a stain on our nation's past, racism in America did not end with emancipation nor the end of Jim Crow. We must recognize how it continues to impact our communities and our nation today as we address issues of environmental justice, voting rights, mass incarceration, police brutality, and inequity in education and housing. Only then can we begin to move forward together as a country.

In the past 400 years, African Americans have struggled and triumphed, making important strides and innovations in science, medicine, business, politics, law, the arts, and

more. As we remember, mourn, reflect, and study horrific parts of our nation's history and work to address systemic racism today, the Commission is also intended to celebrate the many accomplishments of African Americans.

This body has a history of funding the work of similar commemorative commissions and I trust that our support for the work of this commission will be no different. I remember fondly the many celebrations surrounding the 400th anniversary of the Jamestown Settlement in 2007, just a few miles up the James River from historic Point Comfort. As we look forward to the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment next year, I am grateful for the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission and the funding they have received to support their important work. I am also grateful for this body's generous support of the United States Semiquincentennial Commissioners as we prepare to celebrate the 250th anniversary of American independence in 2026.

It was the successes of those previous commemorative commissions that Senator TIM KAINE had in mind when he initially developed the concept for this commission and asked me to introduce his bill in the House of Representatives. Each of these commissions received generous federal appropriations.

While we were successful in getting our bill enacted and the commission established, Congress has yet to appropriate any federal funds to support the work of the 400 Years of African American History Commission. That changes with the Fiscal Year 2020 Interior bill, which already included \$500,000 for the commission. The additional \$500,000 of funding provided in my amendment will ensure that there are sufficient opportunities for the American people to gather, to study, to reflect, and to fully appreciate the story of African Americans, their contributions to the fabric of our nation, and their resilience over the last 400 years.

Mr. Chair, while it is imperative that we observe this year, 2019, as the 400th year since the arrival of the first enslaved Africans in the English colonies with reverence, it is equally important that we celebrate all that our communities have achieved throughout those 400 years.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in marking this occasion, as this body has so many other anniversaries, by fully supporting the Commission's ongoing work. Their efforts to preserve history and invite all Americans to reflect and remember is essential as we continue to work towards creating a more perfect union.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I rise to thank the chair and ranking member for including my amendment to increase funding to help low-income households replace lead pipes in this en bloc amendment.

Even with the plus-ups in this bill for a number of programs within the EPA's State and Tribal Assistance Grant account, and I thank the subcommittee and full committee for their work there, the amount of resources we are providing pales considerable in comparison to the need to address water infrastructure needs.

Let's just look at this program that I am amending today. The program is authorized at \$60 million. Even after the subcommittee provided a \$5 million boost (and I thank the chairwoman for that), it still is only funded at a third of the authorized level.

This is a critical program because grantees are able to provide aid to low-income homeowners to replace lead service lines. Unfortunately, those households most affected by this problem often have the fewest resources to replace the pipes.

Recent media reports indicate that the EPA may be finally closer to issuing its new lead in drinking water regulations.

And while better and stronger regulations help, we won't regulate our way out of the lead poisoning crisis that is afflicting our communities.

We must put our funding where our mouths are. We must help get the lead pipes out of the ground and help homeowners get them out of their homes. We must ensure children get tested and treated, if they need it. We must ensure that homes with lead paint get remediated. And all of that takes funding—there is no substitute for that funding.

Just this past weekend, the city of Milwaukee had the honor of hosting the Great Lakes Governors and Premiers, the chief executives of what would be the third largest world economy if you added up the GDP of the individual states and provinces.

At the top of their agenda was addressing how to provide clean drinking water for the over 105 million residents of the Great Lakes region on both sides of the international border. According to the Governors and Premiers, the Great Lakes region contains the highest concentrations of lead service lines in the United States.

I want to echo the call of the Great Lakes Governors & Premiers for the federal governments "of both the U.S. and Canada to provide appropriate resources . . . to support the accelerated replacement of Lead Service Lines." They also called for a comprehensive approach that leverages "a variety of funding sources and flexibility to match the right tool with each project."

This bill moves us forward—no question. The THUD bill that we are tackling later this week also provides increased funding for HUD's housing lead control programs. But we need to start taking much bigger steps if we are ever going to get to the point where all children will be safe from this scourge.

That's the goal of this amendment. And I thank the chairwoman for her support.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I rise to thank the chairwoman and committee for including my amendment to increase funding by \$1 million for an Indian Health Service program combatting domestic violence in Native communities.

I know the chairwoman understands this issue very well. Protecting women in Native communities was a big focus on the VAWA re-authorization that passed this chamber earlier this year. I want to make sure we provide the strong funding that will be needed to make those changes reality and protect Native women. This is one program that does that.

The Indian Health Services Domestic Violence Prevention Program is a small program but it's having a big impact. The DVPP was established in 2015 as a nationally-coordinated program that provides culturally appropriate domestic violence and sexual assault prevention and intervention resources to American Indian and Alaskan Native communities with a focus on trauma informed services.

The vast majority of DVPP grants focus on domestic and sexual violence prevention, advocacy, and coordinated community responses, with some supporting forensic

healthcare services to victims of domestic and sexual violence.

I appreciate the effort made by the subcommittee in the bill to add funding to bring funding for this program back to the FY 2017 funding level. Thank you for recognizing the need and prioritizing a response.

But I think we must do better especially when you consider the staggering need here.

The statistics (as incomplete as they may be) are frightening: American Indians and Alaska Natives are 2.5 times more likely to experience violent crimes and at least 2 times more likely to experience rape or sexual assault crimes than people who are not American Indians or Alaska Natives. More than 4 in 5 American Indian and Alaska Native women, or 84.3 percent, have experienced violence in their lifetime.

There are currently some 83 tribes, tribal organizations, Urban Indian Organizations, and IHS federal facilities that receive funds totaling nearly \$12 million from this program. These include projects in my city of Milwaukee as well as in Alaska, Nebraska, and Oregon, among others.

I understand the constraints that the subcommittee faces. The needs always outnumber the resources. But this is a pressing priority. This additional funding will hopefully allow for more grantees serving more tribal communities that can help begin to turn the tide.

I know the chairwoman has been a champion for Native American communities and I thank her for her support of my amendment.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Interior Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2020. In 2013, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Office of Law Enforcement established the Wildlife Detector Dog Program as part of a national effort to combat illegal wildlife trafficking. Certified canines and wildlife inspector handlers go through a 13-week training course at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Detector Dog Training Center in Newman, Georgia, and they are trained for real work environments such as mail facilities, ocean containers, and air cargo warehouses. Since the program's inception, USFWS has added more wildlife detectors. There are now six detector dogs deployed at USFWS designated ports of entry: Dutton in Houston, Texas; Beans in Chicago, Illinois; Viper in Miami, Florida; Samm in San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dock in Anchorage, Alaska; and Lockett near my Congressional District in Los Angeles, California.

These highly intelligent canines, paired with highly trained handlers, are able to detect many wildlife scents, such as elephant ivory, sea turtle skin, dried seahorse, python skin, and rhino horn. USFWS has reported that the use of these dogs is far more efficient than deploying human inspectors. For every 1,000 packages sniffed by dogs, 10 packages are properly inspected by humans.

The Wildlife Detector Dog Program strengthens and expands USFWS' inspection capabilities on illegal wildlife products. With more than 18 major ports of entry across the country, I would like to take this opportunity to urge more attention and resources be dedicated to the growth and expansion of this program.

My amendment will designate \$200,000 of Department of Interior appropriations for the Wildlife Detector Dog Program, which is the

estimated cost of adding an additional K-9 unit to the program. I thank Chairwoman McCOLLUM for her support on this amendment and I urge my colleagues to join us in passing it.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 135 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. JACKSON LEE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 135 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce—

(1) the final rule entitled "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 23, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 64662); or

(2) the final rule entitled "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 23, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 64510).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I rise today with an amendment to ensure that no funds go to the Obama-era Clean Power Plan.

In 2015, Obama's Environmental Protection Agency published a final rule for the Clean Power Plan, with the intent to reduce CO₂ emissions from the existing fossil fuel power plants by 32 percent by 2030. It set specific and stringent limits on greenhouse gas emissions for each State based on its electricity mix.

While this sounds well intended, it is important that we look at the costly and burdensome reality of the so-called Clean Power Plan.

It would cause a slew of economic, environmental, and legal problems. Families and businesses would be hit the hardest with more expensive energy and utility bills. And for what?

According to climatologist Paul Knappenberger: "Even if we implement the CPP to perfection, the amount of

climate change averted over the course of this century amounts to about 0.02 centigrade. This is so small as to be scientifically undetectable and environmentally insignificant."

It is evident that the Clean Power Plan is nothing more than a feel-good environmental regulation promulgated by the radical environmental left and is based on a trajectory that is negligible, all while driving up the cost for average American families.

Beyond the negligible effects of the Clean Power Plan, it is legally unfounded and may even be unconstitutional. In the words of Laurence Tribe, who testified before Congress: "EPA is attempting an unconstitutional trifecta: usurping the prerogatives of the States, Congress, and the Federal courts—all at once. Burning the Constitution should not become part of our national energy policy."

Because of its legal issues, more than half the States in the country petitioned the Supreme Court to pause the Clean Power Plan implementations. A stay was issued in 2016.

I strongly commend the Trump administration for taking action on this issue this week and replacing the Clean Power Plan with the Affordable Clean Energy rule. This move paves the way for affordable and clean energy, and I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and support continued American energy dominance.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, whether or not my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to admit it, climate change is real. It is caused by human activity. And it will—I should say, it is even currently now having devastating impacts. If we don't take bold action to reduce climate pollution, it is only going to get worse.

I believe we also have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Limiting pollution from power plants is an important part of an overall strategy to limit carbon pollution and keep global temperatures from rising to levels that will bring unacceptable risks from extreme weather and other climate change impacts.

Therefore, I was extremely disappointed that, on Wednesday, EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler announced a rule that would repeal the Clean Power Plan, replacing it with a rule that will lead to 1,400 more deaths each year.

Those numbers, Madam Chair, are the EPA's numbers. Just think of it.

The administration that is held with the responsibility of protecting America's air and water so that it is fit for human consumption puts out a regulation to limit the pollution that actually increases the amount of pollution

that we emit, causing more deaths, more asthma attacks, more trips to the emergency room.

Every year we continue to see communities devastated by natural disasters related to our changing climate. We are spending billions of dollars each year helping these communities rebuild in the wake of those disasters.

We need action to limit climate pollution. Blocking action to limit carbon pollution from power plants is a step backwards at the exact same moment we should be leaping forward towards cleaner forms of energy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), one of the cosponsors of this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, specifically, the CPP aimed to dramatically reduce carbon dioxide, CO₂ emissions, from new and existing power plants. These new regulations called for an unrealistic 32 percent nationwide cut in CO₂ emissions by 2030 from 2005 levels.

I have just got to tell you, we are wrapping up scientific evidence, and we are putting a moral cloud on it. That is exactly the definition of what Alinsky wanted us to start talking about and moving processes.

These new mandates placed incredible burdens on States. They would have increased the electrical rates and endangered overall reliability of the grid. Due to this unprecedented overreach, Congress rejected these new regulations, using the Congressional Review Act.

Specifically, the Senate voted on November 17, 2015, to reject these rules, and the House followed suit on December 1, 2015. Unfortunately, President Obama decided to veto both of these pieces of legislation and continue his war on coal.

We shouldn't be picking winners and losers. Climate change has been going on for eons of time. That is why you can actually have a fossil coming from Green River, Wyoming, that is nowhere close to the ocean. I vote against this.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I believe I have the right to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), one of the other cosponsors of this amendment.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, this amendment prohibits funds under this act from being used to enforce two rules under Obama's so-called Clean Power Plan.

This plan was administrative overreach, plain and simple. It would have mandated the shutdown of power plants and increased energy costs for families across the country.

The Clean Power Plan is just another example of Obama-era regulations killing American jobs, strangling our economy, and destroying our domestic energy industry.

The proposed Clean Power Plan would have required Arizona, my State, to achieve a 52 percent reduction in the CO₂ emissions rate for affected power plants and to achieve about 90 percent of that reduction by next year, 2020. That was totally unrealistic.

Arizona has Palo Verde nuclear plant. It is the largest producing nuclear plant in the entire Nation. Often Arizona produces more energy than it consumes, and so we sell our energy and our electricity throughout the Southwest. So Arizona energy is American energy.

The regulations that strangle Arizona power generating stations harm American consumers well beyond our borders. I applaud the Trump administration for recognizing the harm of the Clean Power Plan and repealing and replacing it with the Affordable Clean Energy rule.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, to be clear, many States supported the clean energy rules of the Obama administration because they know air knows no boundary. So one State decides it is not going to have clean air rules, and that drifts into the next State, affecting that State's health and quality of life. So it was prudent for the Federal Government to step in and set standards.

No one's power plant was going to be forced to be closed. They were just being told to clean up the air. So when it leaves one State to drift into the next State, it is not causing asthma attacks for children.

I believe we have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Limiting pollution for power plants is an important part of an overall strategy to protect us from the worst impacts of climate change. We owe it to the next generation. They are watching our actions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 136 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 136 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to plan, design, study, or construct, for the purpose of harvesting timber by private entities or individuals, a forest development road in the Tongass National Forest.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is simple. It would restrict the subsidization of logging roads in the Tongass wilderness.

There are currently more than 5,000 miles of road that are used for logging. They are not accessible to the public. These roads are subsidized simply because the timber industry in the Tongass cannot sustain itself. It could not exist other than the fact that we build logging roads for them.

It is a problem on several levels. First and foremost, there is a long-term liability associated with them. Currently, there is some \$90 million worth of deferred maintenance, and if you do not adequately maintain these logging roads, they become an environmental liability.

But more fundamentally, it is undermining this great resource. The true value of the Tongass that makes it unique and the true economic driver of the region is tourism and fishing, which is sustainable.

Alaska has been damaged by climate change more than any other State. The temperature has risen twice what we see in the rest of the country. The Tongass is part of the effort to be able to reduce climate change by providing a carbon sink.

This amendment is supported by many environmental and taxpayer advocate groups: Alaska Wilderness Action, Earthjustice, the Sierra Club. But because it is a profligate waste of tax dollars, we have Taxpayers for Common Sense and Citizens Against Government Waste that have supported this amendment, which has passed Congress in the past on a bipartisan basis.

I urge my colleagues to look hard at this unnecessary subsidization of the destruction of this precious resource making climate change worse while undermining the values that make the Tongass so valuable.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good friend. I am always amazed how many people in this body know what is better for Alaska.

Four times in this last 2 weeks some of you have come out: I know what is best for Alaska.

This Roadless Rule was never to be. It was Obama's decision, and we appealed it, and we won in court. This is State land, a lot of it, we have access to, and we are going to continue that.

You say about climate change, old trees don't consume, new trees do. They clean the air out; old trees do not. We are not talking about, really, timber here, because you can't have a timber sale unless it is put up for sale. We are talking about access across Federal lands, because State land is one side—State land and Federal land in between.

We are asking, very frankly, just to have access. And that is the law. Under the ANILCA law, there was to be no more. Obama changed it by regulation. We are changing it again.

Now, I don't understand where he got this information, how he got it, what he has seen, where he has gone.

You talked about tourism. Tourism is great for you people in Oregon who want to come to Alaska, but it doesn't support our schools. It doesn't support a growing society. It, frankly, supports old growth, which has no value at all, other than to look at for a short period of time when it dies.

We had 32 forest fires last year, because you don't allow roads into an area so we can manage them, and that is wrong.

All we are asking is to have what the State was guaranteed by this body. And you are taking it away from them and saying: You don't have access to your lands. You don't have a right to build anything because you don't have the ability to have a road.

And I stand here as one Member who represents the greatest State in the Union, the largest district. I constantly see people—incinerators, game, timber, mining. Why don't you mind your own damn business? This is not yours.

I am disappointed the gentleman would do this.

You are a friend of mine. Did you ever consult me about this? No. And that is disrespectful.

Maybe I ought to think about something that makes you more respectful to me.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS).

Mr. GALLEGOS. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my friend, for introducing this amendment.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill to codify the Roadless Rule across the

country. For nearly two decades, the Roadless Rule has been an important tool for preserving pristine forests, clean water, and wildlife. It has also protected taxpayers from subsidizing even more costly road building in national forests.

No roadless place is more in need of this protection than Tongass National Forest in Alaska. The Tongass National Forest is home to some of the most undisturbed, temperate, old-growth rainforests in the world.

These 16 million acres of beautiful landscape are also a critical carbon sequestration tool and a resource for climate change mitigation.

Despite these facts and the opposition of many Alaska Native communities, as well as the concerns of the Alaska tourism and sportsmen industries, the State of Alaska has proposed to strip this forest of full Roadless protection.

Stripping Roadless Rule protections from Tongass National Forest will allow millions of taxpayer dollars to be funneled into incredibly expensive road-building projects in one of the most remote, wild parts of our country.

This amendment does not end discussion of how and where the Roadless Rule should be applied in Alaska and other States. It is much simpler than that. All this amendment does is prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to subsidize more old-growth logging in Alaska's Tongass National Forest.

Taxpayers should not have to foot the bill to construct environmentally harmful roads for the logging industry in this pristine place. This is the exact sort of fiscally responsible amendment my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should support. That is why I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in protecting Tongass National Forest and American taxpayers by supporting this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I suggest, when they talk about the taxpayer, these roads that are in place now, maintenance costs were already there. The reason they are not being used is because there is no timber in that area, which have been cut already, a very small amount of the Tongass. I am talking about State land.

By the way, can I ask the gentleman who just briefly spoke, or anybody: Have you been to the Tongass?

Do any one of you want to answer that? No. They are mimicking or parroting what has been fed to them.

This is not the United States of the Federal Government; it is the United States of America. You are taking away the right of a State of access to their land because of this action, and that is wrong.

I said we won it in court. You may not know that. We will win it again, because the law is very clear: There was to be no more in Alaska, but Obama did apply it.

So I am saying: Have at it. It is not going anywhere.

I shouldn't get excited. It is just the idea that you are supposed to be representing a form of government, and you should have a right to represent your district. That is your responsibility.

Stay out of my district, because you are not doing what is right for the State of Alaska, and that is my job. I say shame on you.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alaska has 45 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, 32 fires in 2015. The average over the last 10 years has been 15 to 20 fires. We ought to know better.

In Arizona, I have had to witness the most catastrophic fires in Arizona history because of our mismanagement of forests: The Wallow fire, the largest fire in Arizona history; and then the Yarnell fire, where we lost 19 firefighters.

It is incredible that what we are doing is we are trying to have jurisdiction over fires. There is a reason why we have had to subsidize that: because we have put the industry out of business by sue and settle.

Folks, there is a cost to these fires, and you have to start looking at mitigation in that aspect. If you want climate change mitigation, the best thing you can do is have a dynamic forest that actually produces more oxygen than carbon. That means medium- and small-growth trees, not old-growth trees. A happy medium of all is a dynamic forest.

So if you are preventing this—the gentleman from Arizona ought to know better. We are sitting on catastrophic results in Arizona. Let's not impugn the trees in Alaska.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Chair, first and foremost, my friend from Alaska—who is my friend, and I respect, and have enjoyed our give-and-take over the years—misses the point. What I am talking about is Federal subsidization of logging roads.

I mentioned that there is a deferred backlog that is expensive, that the logging operations that we have do not recover enough money to fully fund the operations and the deferred maintenance. I referenced the fact that we have an opportunity to be able to focus our attention on things that really do make a difference.

I haven't spent time in the Tongass; I have spent time in Alaska. But the principle applies in Oregon and other States in terms of heavily subsidized logging roads.

Logging roads don't make forests safer. They don't prevent forest fires. And as a matter of fact, when we look at logging operations, they are often less sustainable. In fact, logging sometimes causes forest fires and puts people in these areas who cause fires.

Now, I would just respectfully suggest that what I said about Alaska being threatened more by climate change than any other, I am happy to provide my good friend from Alaska the references in terms of verifying the statistics and facts that I have used, but the fact remains this is something we shouldn't do, we don't need, and I strongly urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 139 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 139 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on December 15, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 66496 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Madam Chair, my amendment is straightforward. It would prevent any funds in this bill from being used to carry out the EPA disastrous 2009 Endangerment Finding.

The EPA's Endangerment Finding has served as legal justification for the Federal Government to attack American energy under the guise of climate change since 2009.

The Information Quality Act provides a framework for the oversight of the quality of information disseminated by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, bureaucrats in President Obama's EPA evaded the requirements set forth in the Information Quality

Act by refusing to admit that the document was a highly influential scientific assessment.

If climate change is as dire as some of my colleagues consistently argue, why then did President Obama's EPA go to such lengths to prevent their assessment from rigorous peer review?

Interesting.

In April of this year, President Trump's Office of Management and Budget released a memo to "reinforce, clarify, and interpret agency responsibilities with regard to responsibilities under the Information Quality Act."

In April, the Competitive Enterprise Institute petitioned the EPA to stop using the 2009 Endangerment Finding until it subjected itself to the high-level scientific peer review that is legally required under the Information Quality Act.

CEI's petition to the EPA found numerous instances in which the EPA failed to meet the Agency's own peer review standards for the highly scientific assessments. Some of the failure of the EPA noted by CEI include failing "to allow public, including scientific and professional societies, to nominate potential reviewers," allowing an EPA employee to conduct peer review, utilizing peer reviewers who were reviewing their own work, and reliance on the United Nations Climate Change Panel reports that do not meet Federal peer review standards.

Completely obnoxious.

Now, even the staunchest advocates for taking aggressive action on our climate should be able to agree that the process the EPA used to adopt the Endangerment Finding failed to meet the required peer review process.

Fortunately, there is an alternative. Madam Chairwoman, I believe the best way to improve our environment and to ensure the economic prosperity of this country is to rely on sound science, not on the opinions of unelected bureaucrats at the EPA.

If climate alarmists are so confident that the 2009 Endangerment Finding is sound science, then conduct proper peer review, following the guidelines of the Information Quality Act put forth by OMB, that will assure the outcome.

Madam Chairwoman, this is not a partisan issue. No matter what side of the climate change debate you fall on, we can all agree that the EPA has evaded its responsibility to peer review and developing sound science when authoring its Endangerment Findings.

The process was broken, and good process makes good policy, which makes good politics. This body should not fund the implementation of policies based on the 2009 Endangerment Finding.

Madam Chair, I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, we have many fine employees at the EPA—great employees—and I would be hesitant to put them in the way that sometimes the term "bureaucrat" is used, because sometimes that can feel demeaning. So, to the great scientists in the EPA, I just want them to know that I respect their work.

□ 1430

Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition, as I said, to this amendment, which would prevent the EPA from implementing its endangerment finding that greenhouse gases endanger human health and welfare.

The EPA's endangerment finding is simply a legal restating of something that the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said. Every single scientific academy in the world—and I want to stress that, Madam Chair. I heard the gentleman talk about some kind of peer review, but I am going to go with what the national scientific academies in the world and 97 percent of climate scientists have been telling us for decades. I am going to go with 97 percent of the scientists, Madam Chair.

Whether or not my colleague on the other side of the aisle will admit it, our climate is changing. We know it in Minnesota, and I hear other people from around the country talk about it. And we do know that it is caused by human activity.

We are already experiencing negative impacts from climate change. The severity of those impacts will only increase if we don't reduce climate pollution.

The endangerment finding does not regulate climate pollution, but it does say that we need to take action to address it, and I agree.

We have a moral obligation to future generations to leave this planet better than we found it. Blocking the endangerment rule won't make that happen for future generations.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I ask one simple question: If Members of this body are so confident of the 2009 endangerment findings, then high-quality peer review would result in the same outcome, correct? What would be the fallacy with that?

Once again, good process builds good policy builds good politics. We fail to do that. We want to use science when it is convenient for us. That is the problem.

The other side calls themselves the party of science. Then they should be all for this peer review aspect. But, no, we don't want to do that because it is not convenient.

Once again, I agree. Climates are always changing. That is why we find fossilized fish up in western Wyoming. Was man around during that time? No, not at all. Were the carbon footprints

at that time very similar to what they are today? They were higher at that point in time.

Science has been peer-reviewed, and that is why we have gotten to the point that when I give you one set of circumstances, you get the same outcome. That is what peer-reviewed science is. This country is set upon sound science. We ought to determine that.

Madam Chair, I ask for everybody to vote for this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, what I see is delay by not going with scientists around the world.

Madam Chair, 97 percent of the scientists leading the way on what we should be doing clearly state that human activity has a direct impact on climate change. We can't ignore the dangers of it.

We need urgent and bold action to address climate change. We don't need to be putting our heads in the sand. We don't need to be delaying.

I oppose the taxpayers of this country spending more money when we already have sound science. I oppose wasting time. So I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 140 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 140 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 224, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,720,000) (increased by \$1,720,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Chair, I thank Mr. GOSAR and the Congressional Western Caucus for bringing further attention to the scourge that is chronic wasting disease.

At the beginning of this Congress, I introduced H.R. 837, which would re-

quire the USDA and the Department of the Interior to collaborate with the National Academy of Sciences to study the predominant pathways and mechanisms for the transmission of chronic wasting disease in cervid populations.

There is a lot of CWD research out there—some good, some not so good. What we need is an authoritative and comprehensive scientific consensus on how chronic wasting disease spreads. This study will allow us to pursue the most effective methods to fight CWD, but we cannot do this without the proper resources.

I thank the committee and the subcommittee chairs, ranking members, and staff for increasing CWD funding and for providing language that encourages greater scientific collaboration within the Federal Government. This will set us on the right path to understanding how CWD infects and how it spreads, and it will give the foundation of knowledge we need to build the right policy.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment in order to be able to speak on it.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I thank both gentlemen for their concern and dedication to this issue. In the 1990s when I served in the Minnesota House on our environment and agriculture committee, I first learned of chronic wasting disease and the way that it was frightening hunters and people who like to consume deer meat.

We took some action when I was in the statehouse to address this, only to find out it is a bigger flare-up and something that we need to address.

In my home State of Minnesota, under the leadership of Governor Walz, we are putting more time, more energy, and more resources into working on this issue. That is why my colleagues will find that the House report accompanying the Interior bill highlights the committee's concern about chronic wasting disease and the need to continue to collaborate with partners to develop early detection tools and compounds to disrupt the transmission of this deadly disease.

As of June 7, 2019, chronic wasting disease has been reported in at least 24 States in the continental United States as well as in two provinces in Canada. Once this disease is established in an area, the risks can remain for a long time in the environment, and we are finding out that “a long time” is a long time.

The lack of treatment or vaccines for this insidious disease highlights the need for more research. As a member of the Agriculture Committee, we have been talking to the USDA about what we can do about disposing of these carcasses because this disease not only appears in the wild, it also appears in some captive herds that are used for consumption.

I want my colleagues to know that I look forward to working with them on this issue. I wanted to use this as an opportunity to let both gentlemen know that it is in the report language, and we look forward to the authorizers working more so we can do even more to address this disease.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlemen once again for their amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota. Chronic wasting disease is 100 percent fatal. We have similar diseases like mad cow disease in cattle and scrapie in sheep.

One of the things that we are very concerned with, as the gentlewoman alluded to, is that we have no testing available for hunter populations. Is it communicable to human beings and to other aspects of agriculture? Those are some of the things that we really need to address.

As the gentlewoman said, we have now seen it in 25 States, so it is spreading. Once again, being 100 percent fatal, we have to address this because we have whole populations that are at stake.

We can put our ingenuity to task here. We can solve this problem, but it is at the forefront.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. As a veterinarian, as a physician, he understands the dire ramifications of this. I thank the gentlewoman for accepting this.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 143 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 143 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 286, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I rise today with an amendment at the desk to ensure that we develop energy resources located in a small part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

This development is long overdue, and the decision of Congress to authorize that development through the historic tax reform legislation should not be revisited. We should proceed as planned to further American energy dominance.

The opening of a small part of ANWR for oil and gas drilling will increase access to our resources and will help decrease the prices of oil and gas for the American people.

Alaska contains 192 million acres of parks, refuges, wilderness areas, and nature preserves, and 19.5 million acres of this is in ANWR. Before tax reform and the opening of ANWR, 92 percent of the 19.5 million couldn't legally be touched by drilling.

The law changed to open new opportunities for responsible energy development, and we shouldn't backtrack. This area was set aside to be opened in 1980 by a Democrat-controlled Congress and is limited to 2,000 Federal acres, just 0.0001 percent of the ANWR.

We should move forward with the development of this region as it will create jobs, lower prices of oil and gas, and continue to move us forward with American energy dominance.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and our continued energy success in the United States, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting Chair. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment that would strike section 118 from the bill.

I want to begin by setting the record straight on what section 118 of the Interior bill does and does not do. The opponents of this amendment have characterized the Interior language as preventing energy leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR. That is an outright misstatement, Madam Chair. Although, as I will explain, I can understand why those who championed the inflated revenue numbers 18 months ago might be a little worried.

On the contrary, the language says that when the Department of the Interior offers those leases up for sale, it simply must make sure that the sale raises more than the \$500 million that was promised.

In 2017, the Republicans were putting together their tax bill. The budget resolution directed the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to come up with legislation that would raise \$1 billion over 10 years.

□ 1445

Since the lease, that \$1 billion was supposed to help offset the cost of a \$5 trillion tax cut. In reality, I believe it was a scam to get around a point of order. Once the ANWR provision was included in the tax bill, the Congressional Budget Office said the provision would raise little more than \$2 billion over 10 years, and, by law, half of those revenues go to the Federal Treasury and half go to the State of Alaska.

According to the CBO, which got its information from the Interior Department, the first resale was going to raise \$1 billion with \$500 million going

to the Federal Government. Well, if that \$500 million is what the Interior Department told CBO they could raise from our public lands, then they should have no problem with the language in our bill, because that is exactly what our language does. It tells the Interior Department that if you decide to go forward with the lease sale next year, then you need to raise the \$500 million you promised the American people. That is called accountability, and the taxpayers have a right to expect it.

Now, since we don't know exactly how many acres Interior intends to offer up for lease, and we can't know the exact per acre dollar amount, but if the department leases a minimum of 400,000 acres required by law, then all it needs to do is put out a lease sale requirement to the companies to bid \$2,500 an acre for these public lands.

Apparently, the administration and the congressional opponents are having second thoughts about those promises now and want a little amnesty. On May 21, the Office of Management and Budget sent the Appropriations Committee a letter making it clear that the administration opposes section 118 language. OMB says that the \$500 million figure was arbitrary and unrealistic.

Now, how could the administration claim that that number was arbitrary and unrealistic when CBO estimates were based on the administration's data?

Where was OMB in December of 2017 when CBO first came out?

More importantly, where were the congressional opponents of drilling ANWR back then?

Why didn't they sound a little alarmed 18 months ago?

Why not speak up and say: "Wait a minute, I think this number is too high, maybe it is unrealistic"?

Well, I suspect they thought they would never be held responsible for the projections that they were touting back then, and maybe that explains why the language in the Interior bill is characterized as preventing lease sales. Supporters know that the department is required to live up to the promises everyone made, and they may be unattainable to achieve.

So let me be clear. I oppose opening up ANWR for drilling. But now that it is in the tax bill, we have an obligation to make sure that the American taxpayer is protected, and the language currently in the Interior bill does exactly that, Madam Chair. It ensures that the public property is not given away to the oil and gas industry for a song.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), who is one of the cosponsors of the amendment and the dean of the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We passed the same opening of ANWR 14 times in this House, includ-

ing when the Democrats controlled it, because this was set up by Moe Udall, Senator Jackson, Ted Stevens, and myself for an area that has potential great value to this Nation and, of course, the State of Alaska. That has been decided. Because they said at that time and I said at that time that if Congress was to say we should open ANWR, drilling can take place.

Now, as far as the figures go, one of the things that bothers me, because the statement says 50 percent of the CBO score, one score, the first sale may not make that.

But who is to say what the second sale is going to make or the third sale?

So the total amount is for the Treasury of the United States of America.

This area is not pristine. I have to say that. I wish some people would go up and see it. It has been developed before by defense systems. The people there who live there, the Native people, the Inuits, they support it. The State of Alaska supports it. It is the right thing to do for America.

This is a backdoor approach by certain people of the other party who want to not open ANWR. You lost that battle. We won. For the good of the country, the good of the State, and for the good of the people, we won. This is a back way to stop it.

I believe we are going to raise that money. That is how confident I am. I think the sales will produce what we say. So I am not going to really get excited about this, because it is not going to go anywhere. Thank God we have got two Senators for every State. It is the right thing to do. That is why the Constitution and the forefathers made it that way. So I have got two Senators who will make sure this doesn't go anywhere.

I appreciate those who oppose it. I thank the chairwoman for actually saying she does oppose opening ANWR. I respect that. I happen to support it, and I think I will be proven right.

I believe this amendment is the right way to go. I think we ought to eliminate the question, so I am going to urge a "yes" vote on this legislation. It is the right thing to do. Then let's go forward and really govern for the future. That is important. We are missing that.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, this amendment attempts to change the requirements for oil and gas leases. I will say it's very entrepreneurial in its disguise.

But I want to remind people in regard to how big this aspect is. This is a small, little area. To give you an example, ANWR is the size of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire combined. Energy developed with ANWR is just one-fifth the size of the Dulles Airport. Amazing. If you have ever been there, it is something to be seen.

As the Congressional Western Caucus chairman, we actually took that liberty of going up there and being hosted by the gentleman from Alaska. What you are being told and what is being there in aspect isn't the same.

So, Madam Chair, I actually join the gentleman from South Carolina and ask for a "yes" vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Chair.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. When it comes to ANWR, there is no such thing as a noncontroversial policy provision. This one found its way into the Interior-Environment spending bill at a time when longstanding bipartisan provisions have fallen out.

As I mentioned during general debate on this spending package, we need to remove these poison pill riders before we can reach a longstanding bipartisan agreement. That is why I support the amendment to strike this controversial policy position.

Madam Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. May I inquire how much time I have on closing, Madam Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Well, Madam Chair, facts speak for themselves. This sale was used to offset the tax bill, to keep the American people confident that we were going to have our house in order when the tax bill passed. Well, the first sale was supposed to guarantee \$500 million, and if they get less than that on the first sale, as the gentleman said, how much lower does it go on the second?

I just remind people that we need to protect the American taxpayer on this one and make sure that we don't get taken to the cleaners.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 144 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

AMENDMENT NO. 147 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 147 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 3, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 35824).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, this amendment would prohibit funds for enforcing the Obama administration EPA methane rule. The rule is currently facing litigation and uncertainty, and Congress must act to block this job-killing regulation estimating that it will cost the economy roughly \$530 million annually.

While oil and gas production has increased over 25 percent since 2005, related methane gas emissions have actually decreased over 40 percent during the same period, meaning the industry is doing a good job of regulating themselves.

It is counterproductive for the Federal Government to enact harmful regulations that cause inefficiencies and recklessly spending taxpayer dollars enforcing hardships on true job creators.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from enforcing commonsense rules requiring oil and gas industries to prevent natural gas leaks from their drilling operations. The rule has been in effect for 3 years now, and the oil and gas industry is complying with those regulations.

Preventing methane leaks has an important public health benefit. Leaks from natural gas operations are significant sources of ozone pollution which trigger asthma attacks and send thousands of children to emergency rooms every year.

This rule actually saves the oil and gas industry money because natural gas that is not wasted can be sold.

The proponents of this amendment argue that the rule isn't necessary because oil and gas companies have an incentive to prevent leaks. But the simple fact is leaks continue to happen unless companies are required to prevent

them. People might not like eating their vegetables, but we are all better off for doing it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. My colleague, Mr. MULLIN, is absolutely correct. When former President Obama directed the EPA, BLM, and other agencies to target industries for greenhouse gas emissions, they went directly for the oil and natural gas first.

But this EPA rule targeting methane is completely unnecessary. It is produced as a byproduct of oil and natural gas production, but it is a valuable product in itself that can be sold and is sold. It is something that oil and gas companies routinely capture and sell. They were doing a great job of this even before this rule. It was unnecessary.

Even EPA estimates show that the methane emissions have decreased while the production of natural gas and oil have increased over the same period. The free market has provided an incentive to reduce methane release on its own. There is no further need for the EPA to impose this bureaucratic hurdle. It is expensive. The cost is estimated to cost our economy \$530 million annually. Amazing.

Once again, as Ronald Reagan used to say:

Government is not the solution, government is the problem.

This is a regulation in search of a problem.

Madam Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, in closing, during the conversation that was taking place just a second ago, a comment was made that said it actually saves the industry money. I got have got to step back and think, how is that possible? Because if it was saving the industry money they wouldn't oppose it.

If it is saving money, who would oppose it?

I haven't met a regulation ever from a small business owner—which is the only reason why I am here, because of the job-killing regulations that come out of this place constantly—that has ever saved me any money.

What we are talking about are real jobs that affect real people's lives.

This Congress always talks about job creation and creating job packages. We want to brag about how many jobs we have created. This body doesn't create jobs. We are supposed to create an environment in which job creators can create a job, and we are saying this one will kill jobs.

So why would we support this?

It doesn't make any sense to me.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, we know for a fact that methane leaks

contribute to ground level ozone pollution. We know that that is harmful to human beings. We do know that reducing leaks improves the bottom line for the oil and gas companies.

So I oppose this amendment. And I want to stand with common sense to do everything possible to keep these leaks from happening in the future.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 148 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 148 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) “Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) “Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews”, published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77802);

(4) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) “Addendum to Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) “Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866”, published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of

Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, my amendment would prohibit funds from implementing the social cost of carbon rule.

The Obama administration continuously used social cost of carbon models which can be easily manipulated in order to attempt to justify, once again, new job-killing regulations.

I offered this same amendment yesterday, and, unfortunately, it failed. Until then, the House had a clear, strong record of opposition to the social cost of carbon, voting at least 12 times to block, defund, or oppose the proposal.

We want clean air; we want clean water; and we take care of the land we live on. Using subjective standards to create job-killing regulations is not the way to accomplish this goal.

The social cost of carbon rule is nothing more than more burdensome red tape for the American people.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I am sorry to say that I have to oppose the amendment from the gentleman from Oklahoma and appreciate his thoughts, but he is completely wrong.

The amendment is a harmful rider that would prohibit the EPA from considering the social cost of carbon as part of rulemakings.

The “social cost of carbon” may sound a little confusing to people, but, frankly, it is an estimate of the economic damages associated with the small increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year. It represents, currently, our best scientific information available for incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analysis.

Weakening or eliminating the use of the social cost of carbon as a tool for Federal agencies would ignore the sobering cost of health, environmental and economic impacts of extreme weather, rising temperatures, intensifying smog, and other impacts.

We just cannot afford to abandon science at this critical moment in time. Our country needs to face the challenges ahead of us with climate change and have the best scientific tools available, and this is one.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in support of this commonsense amendment that will protect American jobs and the economy but prohibit funds from being used for implementing the Obama administration’s flawed social cost of carbon, or SCC, valuation.

This job-killing and unlawful guidance sneakily attempts to pave the way for cap-and-trade-like mandates. Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap-and-trade proposals.

Knowing that he could not lawfully enact a carbon tax plan, President Obama attempted to circumvent Congress by playing loose and fast with the Clean Air Act to unilaterally implement this unlawful new requirement under the guise of guidance.

The social cost of carbon is not based on science, and the models can be easily manipulated to arrive at whatever conclusion is desired.

Once again, when we look at carbon, it is a nutrient for plants. To say otherwise is disrespectful. Once again, we play loose and fast with sound science.

So, in regards to this, the House has decisively voted a dozen times to block or defund and oppose the social cost of carbon. I support the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, while I respect the gentlewoman’s opinion—and this is one of those things where we agree to disagree—I do have to say one thing.

She said the science in measuring the social cost of carbon has proven true. Actually, that is not true. The science isn’t there. We actually don’t have a good method to measure the social cost of carbon.

That is why the whole issue is that it can easily be manipulated to fit whatever model they choose, which means that they can pick and choose what type of energy we are able to produce and how we produce it, meaning that they can choose, not the consumer, to say: We no longer want to have fossil fuels as a choice; we only want renewables.

If we are going to be an all-of-the-above country and we are going to embrace industry and entrepreneurs, then we have got to embrace all of the above. If consumers don’t want that, if certain States don’t want to buy fossil fuel energy, then they can choose not to do so.

In Oklahoma, we are all of the above. Not only are we a leader in producing fossil fuels, but we are also the third largest in producing renewables. We believe all of the above.

Our neighbor in Texas, while they are a leader in producing oil, they are the number one in renewables.

Isn’t it ironic that both are red States?

All we are saying here is let’s not manipulate and allow the government

to pick and choose. Let the consumer choose.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I do appreciate my colleague from Oklahoma clarifying that it is a big State for renewables and Texas is as well, and I encourage them to continue farther down that path because that is certainly an important challenge that we have to overcome is having more renewables in our country.

I would again say that climate change is the greatest environmental threat that mankind has ever faced. We need to deploy every available tool at our disposal and address this crisis, including the best available science and economics, which I believe is also represented in the social cost of carbon analysis.

I strongly oppose the Mullin amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HIMES). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 151 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 151 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 288, line 24, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$500,000) (increased by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, today I rise in support of my amendment which would demonstrate the environmental benefits of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement, as well as show the cost of delaying passage of this agreement.

USMCA is groundbreaking in more ways than one. It will create thousands of U.S. jobs, improve our economy, increase U.S. agriculture exports, and reduce our trade deficits with Mexico.

Thanks to President Trump, this trade agreement is also a great achievement for the environment. USMCA brings all environmental provisions into the core of the agreement, which means that they can be fully enforced.

The agreement contains the first-of-its-kind language on improving air quality as well as appropriate procedures for environmental impact assessments.

The agreement takes a commonsense approach by creating a partnership between the U.S. and two of its most important trade allies toward a unified goal of improving the environment.

Importantly, the agreement also maintains each country's sovereignty over their own laws. This will create more environmental benefits than anything offered by my friends across the aisle who, so far, have only come up with eradicating U.S. agriculture, eliminating cows, and eliminating air travel.

My amendment would direct the EPA to use these funds to produce reports that would demonstrate the environmental improvements that we are not benefiting from every day this agreement is not in effect. This way, the American people can see firsthand what the cost of delay truly is.

Just yesterday, Mexico voted overwhelmingly to ratify this agreement. Canada is moving forward as well. It is time for Democrats to decide what is worse for them: giving President Trump a win or allowing the U.S. to remain in an outdated trade agreement that is not up to the standards we hold today.

USMCA is a great agreement for the American people, and it is time to vote. I urge a “yes” vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 156 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 156 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) alter or terminate the Interagency Agreement between the United States Department of Labor and the United States Department of Agriculture governing the funding, establishment, and operation of Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers (or any agreement of the same substance); or

(2) close any of the following Civilian Conservation Centers:

(A) Angell Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(B) Boxelder Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(C) Centennial Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(D) Collbran Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(E) Columbia Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(F) Curlew Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(G) Great Onyx Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(H) Harpers Ferry Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(I) Lyndon B. Johnson Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(J) Jacobs Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(K) Mingo Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(L) Pine Ridge Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(M) Schenck Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(N) Trapper Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(O) Weber Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(P) Wolf Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(Q) Anaconda Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(R) Blackwell Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(S) Cass Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(T) Flatwoods Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(U) Fort Simcoe Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(V) Frenchburg Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(W) Oconaluftee Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(X) Pine Knot Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

(Y) Timber Lake Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on my bipartisan amendment to prevent any funding in this Interior appropriations bill from being used to close or transfer the operation of U.S. Forest Service Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, after overwhelming concern expressed by a broad coalition of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and on both sides of the Capitol, I am pleased to report that the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, has listened to our concerns and informed us that the proposal to end the CCC program will be withdrawn.

Over the past several weeks, I have helped lead this coalition to tell the important story of our Civilian Conservation Centers and the value they provide in supporting rural communities and maintaining our public lands, actively managing our Nation's forests, and helping restore communities harmed by catastrophic wildfires.

I would like to thank Secretary Perdue for listening to the concerns of central Washington communities and for preserving the unique and important role these centers play in rural communities.

I look forward to working in partnership with the CCCs; the U.S. Forest Service; and our many local, regional, and Federal partners in strengthening

these programs so they can continue to efficiently and effectively support the U.S. Forest Service motto of: Caring for the Land and Serving People.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw my amendment, but I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo Mr. NEWHOUSE's comments et large.

The Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers are a critical aspect of rural America's ability to fight fires and do good work in rural America.

I want to applaud Secretary Perdue for reversing his decision. It is one thing to be here in Washington, DC, and think you are counting the taxpayers' money very carefully and doing the right thing; it is another thing to be out in the real world and live the life that we have out there in timber country and know what valuable lessons they provide these at-risk youth who, frankly, would have no other options going forward and, at this point, fight our devastating wildfires. They are adjunct to the professional people that we have out there.

I thank Representatives NEWHOUSE, DEFAZIO, GIANFORTE, and even Senator MERKLEY on the Senate side. This is one area where you have nice bipartisan, bicameral support, and it is an area where it is good to see Congress come together and the executive branch understand the realities of the world.

Mr. Chair, I really appreciate everyone's efforts. It has been fun to work on that.

□ 1515

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank my colleague from the Appropriations Committee for doing this. This is an important amendment that would prohibit any changes to the Job Corps centers or their closure.

I appreciate that Secretary Perdue has announced his change of heart, but I want to make sure that the administration doesn't change the plan again.

I think everyone else has said it very articulately. These are really important operations. They teach our young people a tremendous number of things. They provide full-time and temporary jobs. In New England—as on the West Coast, I am sure—we need a lot of these people to help us with some of the challenges that are going on today.

The Department of Labor had previously announced a proposal to close nine of the facilities. That would have impacted 356 full-time and 107 temporary and contract employees. More

than 3,000 students were at risk of losing the opportunity to develop the skills and work experience they need to get jobs, and that would include the 966 students at centers that have been proposed for closure.

Our Nation would lose out as well. We have already heard some of the ways that would happen on the West Coast, as it certainly would on the East Coast as well. These are countless hours for young people in conservation work, forest restoration work, and wildland firefighting.

To quote a USDA web page, I will say that "there has never been a time when Civilian Conservation Centers were more necessary or a more worthwhile investment in our Nation's future."

Mr. Chair, I concur with the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend and colleague from Maine, Ms. PINGREE, as well as my good friend and colleague from Oregon, Mr. SCHRADER, for their comments.

In the weeks since this proposal had been announced to close the Forest Service Job Corps CCCs, I know my colleagues have, and I also have, received dozens of personal accounts and testimonials from men and women across my district whose lives were profoundly impacted for the better by the CCC program. I will quote a couple of those comments, Mr. Chair.

The first one: "Job Corps saved my life."

"The 10 months I spent at Fort Simcoe were the most beneficial months of my life."

Another person said of the program: The CCC "didn't just change my life but saved my life."

"I am so grateful for Columbia Basin Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center. . . . If they hadn't accepted me, I would be in a different, much worse phase of my life."

Mr. Chair, I would, again, like to thank the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. PERDUE, for hearing the strong support expressed by my colleagues and myself on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service Job Corps CCC program.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully withdraw the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 158 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 158 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 285, strike line 6 and all that follows through line 25.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 445, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, this amendment is pretty simple. Section 117 in division C of the base text of the bill prevents the Department of the Interior from carrying out a NEPA review, a National Environmental Policy Act review, for the planning of offshore energy production.

Mr. Chair, we just heard a few amendments back, debate about the importance of science, the importance of data. Let's be clear what this provision does. This provision prevents the Federal Government from opening up the plan for an environmental review, from subjecting it to public feedback. It prevents data and information to make informed decisions.

Mr. Chair, there is a process under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act where you go do an offshore plan. It is a pretty clear process. If folks have a problem with that, amend the law. Amend the law, don't use the appropriations process to prevent the public from getting access to information and access to data so the Federal Government can make an informed decision.

This is flawed text of the amendment. Our amendment simply helps to address it, to allow for an open, public process so we can make the right, informed decision with the right science and the right data, as my friends were recently speaking about.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would strike section 117 from the bill.

I have been a strong opponent of the current administration's offshore drilling proposals. I am proud to have the chance to manage this time in opposition to this amendment, which would be so devastating to States like my home State of Maine.

I want to start by correcting a mischaracterization that I think has been made. The description of the gentleman's amendment states that it is removing language from the Interior bill "which prohibits funds" for the administration's 5-year offshore drilling plan. That is actually not correct.

The language in the bill does not prohibit the administration from working on its plan. What the language in section 117 does is to tell the Interior Department that if it moves forward with oil and gas activities in 2020, it must do so only with respect to lease sales that have been through the entire approval and review process spelled out in the law.

Our language recognizes the fact that the 2017 offshore drilling plan under the previous Presidential administration is the only plan that has completed all the steps required by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Because of

that, we agree that the Interior Department is free to continue to implement the previous 2017 narrow plan.

In the meantime, it is true that the current administration is working on a new oil and gas drilling plan that would cover the 2019 to 2024 timeframe. This new plan, if implemented, would open up the entire East and West Coasts to drilling.

To date, the current administration has put out one iteration of its plan, with two more to go. Despite not having completed the process, the administration has acknowledged it is already conducting pre-lease work in the mid-Atlantic, south Atlantic, and southern California planning areas.

The budget for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management states that it is preparing “four new environmental impact statements for the lease sales that are planned in early 2020 or early 2021,” which is where the problem comes in.

The new 5-year plan, which is nothing more than a work in progress, is under siege, both from the courts and a complete lack of political support. In late March, a Federal court reinstated the moratorium in the north Atlantic planning area. That decision has essentially frozen work on the new plan.

In fact, the Secretary told me, under questioning in an Interior Subcommittee hearing last month, that he did not know the outcome of the proposed plan. He said a new plan wasn’t “imminent.” He was also quick to point out that no previous 5-year plan has ever included drilling in a State that was opposed to such activity.

If that is his bottom line, then he might as well throw in the towel right now as there is not a single State along the Atlantic or Pacific Coasts that is in favor of drilling.

My home State of Maine has a \$5.6 billion tourism industry, 71 percent of which comes directly from the Maine coast. Thirty thousand Mainers make their living in marine industries. Our world-famous lobster fishery alone brings in \$500 million annually.

Our Governor, our Senators, our congressional delegation, and many of our cities and towns oppose the OCS drilling proposal.

As nearly one-third of the United States population lives in the coastal areas impacted by this proposal, and there is broad bipartisan opposition to this issue, moving forward makes no sense, either fiscally or practically.

The language in our Interior bill simply supports that position. It says to follow the law, complete all procedural steps, including responding to the concerns of the American public, the concerns of their Governors, and the concerns of their Members of Congress, before moving forward on individual drilling projects.

To the Department, it says to save its money until it completes the process and finds out if it can drill for oil off the coast of South Carolina or off the coast of Florida or off the coast of California.

Following a well-thought-out process, especially one contained in law, shouldn’t be controversial, and I don’t think it is.

As such, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana; protect our coastlines from Maine to Florida, from Washington State to California; and support the process contained in the OCS Lands Act.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chair, section 117 of this bill is just another example of the anti-American energy agenda being pushed by this Democratic majority.

The draft Outer Continental Shelf leasing program proposed by the Trump administration is actually a forward-looking energy policy that takes full advantage of our vast offshore oil and gas resources. This includes expanding lease sales in the eastern Gulf of Mexico in a manner that does not interfere with our critical defense mission.

In fact, fully utilizing our offshore mineral resources in the Gulf is vital to our national defense because it will make the U.S. more energy independent and will let us continue to be the worldwide leader in energy production.

The draft proposal in this program will also create thousands of jobs and boost economies of energy-producing States like Louisiana.

We should not delay offshore mineral leasing. Any attempt by the Democrats to stop an America- and Louisiana-first energy policy should be fought tooth and nail.

Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend for offering this amendment to strike section 117, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, let me run through a few points here to see if I can clarify a number of the remarks.

The base text of the bill actually prevents the Department of the Interior from carrying out the steps that are required.

Think about the concept of what was said, Mr. Chair. It was said that they want the Department of the Interior to follow the law. Well, what would they be doing otherwise?

The provision in the bill, section 117, prevents them from carrying out pre-leasing activities. This text prevents them from being able to follow the law.

I am baffled by this, and I am happy to have a much longer discussion on how an offshore plan and leasing program is put together.

What the base text of the bill does is it tries to force the Obama-era plan from ever being changed. The base text prevents the process that is in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act from being allowed to go forward.

Mr. Chair, what is really important to talk about here, when you go back to look at what energy policies and different administrative policies have done, do you know that back during the Obama administration in 2011, one half of this Nation’s trade deficit was attributable to us bringing in energy from other sources, bringing them in from foreign countries, empowering their economies, creating jobs in their countries?

I am an American. I represent people here. I am trying to help make sure that we have a healthy economy and that we have affordable energy.

Mr. Chair, folks are going to try and say, oh, this affects emissions and climate change. Our gas, which is replacing the dirtier Russian natural gas, is actually reducing global climate emissions, which is part of our strategy that has resulted in the United States having greater emissions reduction than any other country in the world.

It is really fun to go out and talk about all these things, but we have to keep this based in facts and statistics. This amendment makes sense. It simply does allow the Department of the Interior to follow the law, making sure we maximize our resources.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am sorry to disagree, but I hope that my colleagues won’t be fooled by the comments coming from the proponents of this amendment.

This is not about energy security or energy imports and exports. It is not about jobs. Instead, this is about whether the Interior Department is going to be held to the same procedural standard we expect every other department and agency to adhere to.

□ 1530

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues think the Department of the Interior should follow the law and complete the process, then I urge them to oppose the gentleman’s amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to Joint Resolutions of the following titles in which