

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 27. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and Australia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 30. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 31. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 32. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 33. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 34. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 36. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 38. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 40. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 41. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 42. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and North-

ern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services.

S.J. Res. 43. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 44. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S.J. Res. 45. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 46. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 47. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

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

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO- PRIATIONS ACT, 2020

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 161 OFFERED BY MR. HICE OF
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HIMES). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 161 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. 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. _____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 23.6 percent.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because of my deep concerns over our national debt.

At a time when our Federal debt exceeds \$22 trillion, I believe it is time that we make every effort possible to rein in spending so that we are not shackling future generations with this burden.

Division C of H.R. 3055 funds the EPA, Department of the Interior, and other land management agencies at \$37.4 billion and increases spending by \$1.6 billion over fiscal year 2019 levels.

The spending level in this division is 23.6 percent over the President's budget request. That is almost \$7 billion over the request, Mr. Chairman. We are not even close.

Without question, there are areas within these Federal agencies that need improvement. For example, we need desperately to fix the National Park Service maintenance backlog, and I commend Ranking Member BISHOP for his diligent work on that effort, and would urge passage, and at least bring to the floor his thoughtful and cost-effective bill to address that issue. But at the end of the day, the bottom line is our constituents back home are required week after week, month after month to make tough choices when it comes to planning their own household budgets, and we need to do the same right here in Congress.

My proposed amendment will reduce spending levels to the President's original budget request so that, just like our constituents back home, we go back to the table, we go back to the drawing board, and we make those same tough decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment to rein in spending, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. I appreciate the thoughts of the gentleman, but this is the wrong place to go about it.

This amendment just indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without any thought to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill.

For instance, this cut would result in fewer patients seen at the Indian Health Service, fewer safety inspectors ensuring accidents do not occur, deferred maintenance on our Nation's water and sanitation infrastructure.

More generally, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands will be halted and the associated jobs will be lost.

This amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less.

Yes, it is true the Interior budget does not meet the same numbers that the President sent over to us, but the President cut the Environmental Protection Agency by a third, he cut the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities. I can make a very long list that the President cut that this Congress would never stand for.

So this does not stand. We cannot go back to the President's original budget. We must stand together to oppose this amendment, which if it was passed, would harm the American people.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HICE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 163 OFFERED BY MR. BANKS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 163 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BANKS. 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. _____. 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. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It reduces spending in this division by 14 percent, the amount that is needed to avoid busting the budget caps and preventing sequestration.

With these spending packages, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are making it clear that they have no interest in reducing our national debt. If they did, they would not be proposing bills that would bust the budget caps by nearly \$90 billion, which they are fully aware would trigger sequestration and lead to devastating and severe cuts to our national defense.

In this division alone, they are proposing to spend \$37.2 billion, which is \$1.73 billion above the previous year's enacted amount and \$7.2 billion over the President's 2020 request. This does not even include the \$2.2 billion in additional funding that is not subject to the caps.

Again, my amendment would bring spending in this division to the level needed to avoid sequestration through a 14 percent across-the-board cut.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment, once again, indiscriminately cuts programs in this bill without any thought to the relative merit of the programs contained in the bill.

To just reiterate again, fewer patients would be seen at Indian Health Services, fewer safety inspectors would be ensuring that we don't have oil and

gas accidents on public lands or the other areas which they oversee, deferred maintenance on our Nation's drinking water—we don't want another Flint—deferred maintenance on sanitation infrastructure.

One of the things that Members came up and asked me for, by and large, to make sure that we took a hard look to see what we could do to make sure that we protected our Nation's drinking water, and we moved on what we could do with our sanitation infrastructure.

The National Estuary Program by the President was zeroed out; the USGS science was cut; school construction for Native American children, the future of their communities, the future of our shared Nation, zeroed out; the arts, the humanities, zeroed out; and the EPA cut by 31 percent, the agency that is in charge of making sure we have clean air and clean water.

More generally, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands would be halted and the associated jobs would be lost.

This legislation in front of us today that we are talking about creates lots of good jobs, lots of good-paying construction jobs that are important to the health of our communities.

This amendment would not encourage agencies to do more with less. They would simply force the agencies and our constituents to do less with less, and they have been doing that for too long.

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

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Chairman, frankly, the arguments from my colleagues who oppose this amendment simply don't add up.

By busting the budget caps, the non-defense programs that they are so passionately defending would face \$55 billion in automatic cuts.

So it seems my colleagues are willing to allow reductions in nondefense spending if they can also force reckless defense cuts that endanger national security.

While that may be acceptable to those on the other side of the aisle, it is not acceptable to me.

My amendment will bring spending in this division to the level needed to avoid sequestration and to protect our national security.

Mr. Chairman, when I ran for this position, I promised my constituents that I would do my part to rein in Washington's spending addiction and safeguard the strength of the American military.

Mr. Chair, I am proud that this amendment accomplishes both of those goals. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chair, I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Under Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

That function resides within the appropriately named Appropriations Committee, and I take great pride in having served on this committee.

Every year, we dedicate a great deal of time to crafting and amending the annual spending bills to fulfill this constitutional responsibility and to keep the Federal Government operating.

We spend countless hours hearing from agency officials, outside advocates, and our fellow Members of Congress about our budgetary needs. We make tough choices regarding prioritization.

That is why I must oppose this amendment and I oppose the previous amendment.

Rather than evaluating the worthiness of each individual program, the amendment would indiscriminately cut funding across the board.

Such drastic cuts could harm bipartisan efforts to improve healthcare for American Indians and Alaska Natives; combat invasive species like Asian carp and zebra mussels; prevent devastating wildfires; address the maintenance backlogs at National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service sites; and provide payments to local communities under the Payment in Lieu of Taxes, or PILT, program.

Therefore, even though I share some of the gentleman's concerns about the excessive spending in these bills, I must oppose the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, am I correct that the author of the amendment has yielded back his time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has the only time remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, first, I would just like to address some of the comments that the gentleman made.

I have the honor and privilege of serving on the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee as vice chair with Chairman VISCLOSKEY, and I take great pride in the bipartisan work, the non-partisan work that we do to make sure that our military is strong and our intelligence agencies have the tools they need to keep America safe.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to add that for the record, because there was, I think, some confusion as to where I and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee on both sides of the aisle, when it came to defense, what our positions were. Our positions are making sure our servicemen and -women have what they need to fulfill their mission and come home safely.

But going back to the comments about this amendment, we need to

stand together. We need to stand together to oppose this amendment, because it will harm the American people.

There will be less clean water to drink, our air will be not as well protected, people will go without healthcare, and our communities will suffer.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Mr. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

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

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 165 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 165 printed in part B of House Report 116–119.

Mr. BIGGS. 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 for the Integrated Risk Information System of the Environmental Protection Agency.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I heard right, the previous two amendments were criticized for being overly broad and indiscriminate in the ways that they attacked spending in this particular underlying legislation. Well, I am laser focused. I am laser focused with my amendment.

My amendment would restrict funds from going to the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS. That program is supposed to be developing impartial science-based toxicity assessments on chemicals for uniform use within EPA, and if that is what they were doing, I would not be standing before you today. But as I came to know all too well as I worked with former Chairman Lamar Smith and while serving as chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology's Subcommittee on Environment in the last Congress, the reality is different.

Over the past decade, IRIS has been repeatedly criticized by the National

Academy of Sciences and the Government Accountability Office for its lack of transparency and improper use of scientific methods, which have led to some significantly flawed risk assessments over the years. In fact, GAO first added IRIS to its list of government programs that are highly vulnerable to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in 2009. In the decades since, IRIS has made very few steps towards significant improvement.

I strongly believe that instead of allowing a flawed and poorly managed agency like IRIS to continue to operate, we should return chemical assessments to the relevant program offices within the EPA itself.

In the last Congress, I introduced legislation to achieve the reforms I have outlined. That bill was reported out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee last fall. I have reintroduced that bill again in this session, but it is laying in the Science Committee without further action.

I believe that until there is a root-and-branch reform of the chemical assessments process at the EPA, we simply cannot allow IRIS to spread misinformation to the public as it is doing now.

I urge all Members to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I would like to clear up a little bit of information.

There was a time a short while ago where the National Academy of Sciences asked the EPA, under the IRIS program, to tighten up their process. It needed fixing. It needed adjusting.

The Agency reacted. They got an A-plus rating from the scientists now. So the fine-tuning that was unnecessary to make this good program even greater happened.

But what this amendment would do is it would prohibit the EPA from funding the Integrated Risk Information System. Now, the Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS, is an electronic base containing information on human health effects that may result from exposure to various chemicals in the environment.

This was developed by the EPA's staff with consistent information to uniform risk assessments and regulatory decisionmaking with respect to health effects from exposures to chemicals found in the environment.

There is a chemical right now that has captured the attention of people all across the United States, in fact, across the world, and it is PFOS.

We need now, more than ever, to be laser focused, working with IRIS to do everything we can to get the data and the information so we know the health

effects from being exposed to these chemicals for both military and civilian people all across the United States. It is a very serious problem, and IRIS' program review process is widely considered to be a gold standard when it comes to accessing chemical toxicity.

Now, it is based on extensive scientific literature; it is peer-reviewed; and IRIS' toxicity assessments are relied upon by programs at the EPA and across the Federal Government, by States, and it is because of the high quality of the assessments.

Because these assessments assess risk across a variety of exposure paths, assessments can inform regulatory decisionmaking across all media offices in the EPA. So they can look at it holistically and be making very informed decisions.

It is no surprise, Mr. Chair, that the chemical industry has long sought to undermine the IRIS program. From their point of view, the less the public knows about the risk from toxic chemicals, the more money the chemical industry can make. We ought to be looking out for the safety and welfare of the American people, not the bottom line polluters who profit from pollution.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify for those in the Chamber who may not be aware, IRIS is an information-collecting entity, not a regulator. If IRIS were eliminated, EPA would still maintain an office of research and development, which would perform chemical assessments in coordination with a specialized program office within the Agency. What will compromise public safety is a poorly run government office spreading misinformation.

I also want to point out that both the nonpartisan NAS and GAO have repeatedly criticized IRIS over the past 10 years. Even the few NAS and GAO recognitions of improvements to IRIS over the years have been strongly tempered by caveats that far more work needs to be done.

For instance, the 2018 NAS report, which has been cited, suggests that IRIS still has not produced a basic handbook to guide its operations, even though that recommendation was made more than 4 years ago. This agency has been in existence since 1986 without a handbook, a basic handbook.

Just to add a little bit more color to this debate, here is an example of how absurd IRIS risk assessments can be. It sets the risk value of the chemical ethylene oxide, which is often used to sterilize medical equipment, at 100 parts quadrillion. That is a 1 with 15 zeros behind it. That value is 19,000 times less than the naturally occurring level of ethylene oxide in the human body. For perspective, OSHA sets the risk level for ethylene oxide at one point per million, which is a vastly higher threshold than IRIS itself.

I can speak similarly about flawed IRIS risk assessments related to formaldehyde or acetone, a substance found naturally in breast milk.

To sum up, absurdly assessed risk either creates unwarranted public panic or cynical disregard. Neither outcome creates a safer society.

Even worse, if IRIS is overly focused on evaluating the safety of low-risk or, in some cases, effectively no-risk chemicals, then it is likely to be distracted from assessing truly dangerous substances.

Again, I invite my colleagues to support this very important laser-focused amendment. We are not overly broad here. We are focusing on one program that has been completely—not repudiated, but certainly been highly criticized by the National Academy of Science and the GAO.

I urge my fellow Members to support this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 167 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 167 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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—

(1) to conduct or authorize any person to conduct geological or geophysical exploration for oil or gas, pursuant to section 11(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340(a)), in any area located in the Atlantic Region Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Proposed Final Program described in the notice entitled "Notice of Availability of the 2017-2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Final Program," published by the Department of the Interior in the Federal Register on November 23, 2018 (81 Fed. Reg. 84,612); or

(2) to prepare or supplement an Environmental Impact Statement or Environmental Assessment, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. §4321 et seq.), and its associated regulations, for any such exploration.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my straightforward, commonsense amendment to the Interior-Environment appropriations bill that would prevent BOEM from issuing permits for seismic exploration in the Atlantic Ocean.

South Carolinians have made it explicitly clear where we stand on this issue. Far too much is at stake in our State. South Carolina's tourism economy is worth \$22.6 billion a year, and two-thirds of that comes from the coast.

While folks may disagree about the amount of oil deposits that exist in the Atlantic Ocean, most would agree that the amount of oil off the coast of South Carolina is minimal and far less than the amount of revenue that the State brings in from tourism, recreation, and commercial fishing.

Put simply, the people of the Lowcountry understand that the risk isn't worth the reward. Or, as my grandmother said: "The juice ain't worth the squeeze."

Our beaches, our economy are not for sale.

And it is not just South Carolina that feels this way. It is Florida. It is Virginia. It is New Hampshire. It is North Carolina. It is Pennsylvania. It is New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington. From coast to coast, communities have made it clear that they do not want to put the marine ecosystems and their coastal livelihoods at risk, which is why so many of my colleagues from all over the country have joined me in sponsoring this amendment.

Seismic exploration is incredibly dangerous in its own right. Seismic air guns create an underwater blast louder than all but military-grade explosives. Companies fire air guns as often as every 10 seconds for days, weeks, to months on end. This can have impacts across the entire ecosystem, from marine mammals to fish to plankton.

But beyond that, seismic exploration is a major step towards this administration's ultimate goal of seeing drilling rigs up and down the Atlantic coast. High-ranking officials have said it clear as day: The only reason they are working so hard on these seismic permits is so they can open up the Atlantic to drilling by the highest bidder.

Drilling in the Atlantic would put the health of our ocean and our coastal economy at risk, and it is a massive investment in a future of dirty and dangerous offshore drilling that an overwhelming majority of people from both parties all along the Atlantic Coast oppose. I stand with them in opposition to both seismic testing and oil drilling. Far too much is at stake.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, we had the same discussion yesterday. Once again, these are offshore leases that are part of the American public's domain, not the State of South Carolina or California or Massachusetts or Florida. I understand that application.

But, once again, we also have heard that we want to have responsible renewable energy, so we are actually predisposing no seismic aspect. Well, how do you actually look at moorings in regard to subsurface anchors if you didn't use seismic activity? That is contradicting all the way around the aspect here.

Once again, this just shows that we want nothing of the sort: no seismic, no wind, no solar, no oil and gas. That is unbelievable.

If this is the kind of attitude that we want going forward, those in Arizona and the Western States that have public lands ought to be getting a lot more say in those applications.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 20 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. And when we start looking at it, maybe what we ought to do, if we are talking about oil spills, one of the worst ways to actually import oil is through boats. So maybe we ought to disallow ships, because a ship that has an accident is one oil spill away from anywhere.

So this just begs my indifference in regards to what the heck we are trying to do here. It is looking at our assets. We have a due diligence to the American people to look at those assets for public assets.

□ 1600

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, respectfully, I would disagree with Mr. GOSAR. South Carolinians have the opportunity to say what goes on off of South Carolina's coast. Voters have made it very clear on this issue.

This is not Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an issue that has been supported by Republican Governor McMaster, who has made it clear that he opposes offshore drilling.

I would ask that my conservative Members of this body, that that conservative ideology also translates to conserving our natural resources, and for that idea of federalism to extend to offshore drilling so that States have a say. And States have spoken in South Carolina, and other States as well.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, let's break this apart a little bit. So my friend from South Carolina has proposed this amendment because he wants to protect the environment.

Well, let's look at what happens when you do this.

My friend sat in the House Committee on Natural Resources where we had experts, not people standing here behind the microphone, but real experts who came to the Congress, who testified before us, and who said: We have looked at this issue when you stop producing energy domestically. We have looked at it. And what happens when you stop producing it domestically? You import it. You import it from foreign countries.

All right. So, one, you are not stopping the production of energy. You are just doing it in another country, and you are paying them and creating jobs there.

Number two, when you do this, you still have to actually ship the energy. It doesn't just pop up in the socket. You have to ship the energy.

Look at the studies. Look at the reports. You have a greater chance of threatening your global environment, threatening the coast of South Carolina by transporting it by ship.

Look at the statistics. It is safer to do exploration and production activities, to put it in a pipe in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my friend was there and heard the witnesses talk about this. It is important that we make sure that we are doing things that don't just feel good, but things that will actually achieve the goal of protecting our environment in the United States. This amendment is flawed.

Now, look. The other thing, Mr. Chairman, I think is important is what this prohibits is it prohibits us from actually doing a resource assessment. Maybe there is an assessment and it is determined that it doesn't make sense to produce energy there. Well, let's make an informed decision.

Last thing, Mr. Chairman, is about ecological productivity. Off the coast of Louisiana, where we reproduce somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of all of the offshore energy, the conventional energy in the United States in Federal waters, we have the second most productive fisheries in the Nation, only behind Alaska, another State that does offshore energy production. We have multiple times more fisheries than my friend's home State of South Carolina.

So the whole ecological productivity argument is just not supported by the facts. If you support the environment, if you support ecological productivity, if you support American jobs, you oppose this amendment. If you support Russian gas, if you support Vladimir Putin, if you support a dirtier environment, I urge you to vote in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues, again, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, who have supported this amendment and who have supported H.R. 1941, as well. I thank my colleagues, my conservatives, who support conservation.

Mr. Chair, I would urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bipartisan commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. 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. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 168 OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 168 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 235, line 11, 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 South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I want to recognize the great work of Chairwoman McCOLLUM in finding ways to increase funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The chairwoman and members of the committee have shown a strong commitment to this important program, and I applaud their efforts.

One of the first things that Congress did was pass into law the bipartisan lands package, which permanently authorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This demonstrated what we can achieve when we work together on behalf of our constituents.

LWCF not only promotes access to our public lands, but helps ensure all Americans can utilize these publicly owned resources. It is important that we build off that bipartisan work by making sure that this important program receives the funding it deserves in our final spending bill.

LWCF provides hundreds of millions of dollars to States that are challenged with coastal erosion, loss of open space, and trying to balance a need to protect species habitat with urban growth demands.

It also supports our States and communities by funding stateside programs that promote recreation, responsible community development, and provide opportunities to get Americans outdoors.

When LWCF was created, it was agreed that funding from oil and gas development would be used to achieve conservation objectives across the country. This program balances resource development with conservation and opens access to our public lands for hunters, anglers, and back country users.

I strongly support LWCF, and I appreciate the efforts my colleagues have made to secure the future of this program. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of my amendment, as well as the underlying bill.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, I have been sitting on the floor. I sat in the House Committee on Natural Resources yesterday and heard this assault on oil and gas. So I want to remind everybody that the only mechanism to fund LWCF is actually these funds from the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas.

It is amazing. It is absolutely amazing that we have this rhetorical conversation on the House floor.

So we are against adding any access to know what the resource actually is by seismic. We are responsible on behalf of these resources to the American public. Yes, the American public actually owns these jurisdictions. And what we are doing is we are leveraging as that opportunity to fund LWCF.

Be careful, Will Robinson, what you are asking for.

Those responsible applications, we heard it over and over from the gentleman from Louisiana. Once again, these are an asset of the American people, not South Carolina, not Florida, not California, not Massachusetts. So responsible applications here, we have got to be taking in good stewardship.

So with that in mind, I caution everybody that LWCF is the only mechanism for funding is these Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas leases.

These are responsible aspects, and they actually know what the resources are. You are going to need seismic, if you are going to look at alternative energy aspects, particularly wind, in regards to permanent moorings.

So from that standpoint, I just offer a cautionary plea. Be careful what you ask for. You may end up having no funding at all.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlemen from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), my esteemed colleague.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from

South Carolina for his leadership on this amendment.

With respect to the Member from Arizona, I, given his comments, look forward to him voting for this amendment as well. It is an incredibly important amendment, and, ultimately, this program has been our Nation's premier conservation program for over 50 years.

I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for their work to reprioritize the program after the President's budget actually proposed drastic cuts to LWCF. As a result of their efforts, the bill before us today would provide the highest level of funding for the program in 17 years.

I have the great honor of representing the State of Colorado, and I have seen firsthand the benefits that LWCF brings to our State. Colorado received \$278 million in LWCF funding over the last decades, including for a variety of areas in my district: Rocky Mountain National Park, Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, to name just a few.

LWCF not only conserves critical land; it is an investment in outdoor recreation economies. Studies have shown that every dollar invested in the LWCF is \$4 in economic value from natural resource goods and services.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for bringing forth this amendment. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues for their commitment to the Land and Water Conservation Fund and for joining me in offering this commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chair, I would urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of 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. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 176 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 176 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Mr. CARBAJAL. 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 oil and gas leasing, preleasing, or related activities in the Washington/Oregon, Northern California, Central California, and Southern California Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I am offering an amendment to make it clear to the administration that we will not sit idly by as they attempt to open up our shores to further oil and gas development. We will not allow our treasured natural resources to be sold to Big Oil, and we will not put corporate profits above protecting our environment and our local coastal economies.

My amendment would put in place a moratorium on offshore oil and gas drilling and related activities in the four planning areas off the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf for fiscal year 2020.

My constituents on the central Coast have seen firsthand the devastating impacts of some of the largest oil spills in California history, like the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. Most recently, the 2015 Plains All American oil spill in my district cost \$92 million to clean up. These incidents show us that we cannot afford yet another disastrous oil spill.

In contrast, California's coastal region generates over \$1.9 trillion of GDP and supports more than \$731 billion in wages.

Future oil drilling would pose a direct threat to our local economies, businesses, and tourism, which are tied to our clean oceans and healthy ecosystem.

Since the 1969 oil spill in Santa Barbara, there has not been a new or expanded lease in California State waters, or one in Federal waters since 1984.

This policy has enjoyed support from both Republican and Democratic administrations. Yet this administration today seems tone deaf to this reality. Instead, they are asking to hold seven new lease sales in the four planning areas off the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

I urge passage of my amendment, which would protect nearly 650,000 jobs in our region.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CARBAJAL, my good friend, for his leadership on this amendment.

I am proud to cosponsor this amendment which would prohibit future oil and gas sales off the West Coast, including my beautiful home State of Washington.

The fact is the people of Washington State don't support drilling off our coast. Our commercial and recreational fishermen who generate billions in economic impact for our State don't want to see our fisheries compromised by another disaster like the 1988 spill which released more than 230,000 gallons of oil and affected over 110 miles of our coastline.

The 17 Native American Tribes who have fished throughout the Puget Sound watershed since time immemorial don't want to see our coastline exposed to these harmful and polluting activities.

Our shellfish growers, who support roughly 3,200 jobs in our State, don't want to see their jobs threatened. They saw how the Deepwater Horizon spill devastated Louisiana's coastal economy.

□ 1615

Coastal towns including Ocean Shores, Westport, Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Montesano, Long Beach, and Ilwaco have passed resolutions saying they don't want it.

Even former Department of the Interior Secretary Zinke in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year admitted that the oil and gas industry doesn't want to drill off the coast of Washington because there aren't the resources or infrastructure to do it.

He also said, "I think I'm going to mark down Washington as opposed to drilling."

Mr. Chair, I believe this body ought to mark Washington State down as off-limits to drilling, and this amendment does that.

This matters to our economy. It matters to our region's identity. The survival of the last 76 southern resident orca left in the world depends on keeping the Puget Sound protected from the harmful impacts of oil and gas development.

There is a lot at stake here. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the will of the residents of the State of Washington and pass this amendment.

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

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, we don't need a moratorium off the coast of California. We actually need a resurgence in domestic energy development offshore.

I heard from the gentleman that the last oil spill was in 1969. Let's see, it is 2019. Fifty years later, technology has been much different.

While the local demand for oil in California has dropped over the last 40 years, foreign dependence has increased from 5 percent to 57 percent.

In 2018, California imported 135 million barrels of oil from Saudi Arabia alone. According to the national offshore energy industry, leasing in the 240 million acres of currently off-limits areas would support an additional 165,000 jobs and inject \$15 billion in annual contributions to the economy.

There are already 23 active oil platforms in Federal waters adjacent to California. Once again, let me repeat, there are 23 active oil platforms in Federal waters adjacent to California. These platforms produced nearly 17,000 barrels of oil per day in 2016 and

brought in \$32.8 million in total royalties in fiscal year 2016. In a State that is importing 57.5 percent of its refined oil from foreign nations, it is imperative that we take the opportunity to utilize domestic energy supply.

Once again, let's highlight that: 57.5 percent is from overseas, which is much dirtier than what we produce here. If we are concerned about climate change and emissions, we ought to be importing less and looking at what we actually do.

Last but not least, I would like to remind everybody that we just had a conversation on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is funded exclusively by Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas. Once again, the people who don't want this for their States, maybe they should turn down LWCF funding because it seems contradictory to the conversation.

Once again, I remind my colleagues that Federal waters belong to the U.S. people, not the States of California, Florida, South Carolina, or Massachusetts. We have a due diligence to look at the management of those resources.

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

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Chair, clearly, my colleague from Arizona was not paying attention. The last oil spill was in 2014.

Again, I will state that what we need to be doing is weaning ourselves off fossil fuels and investing in renewable energy like most progressive countries are doing.

The West Coast, California, and the coast of the 24th Congressional District cannot tolerate another oil spill. The benefits of oil exploration and development off our coasts do not outweigh the risks. We need to keep that in mind. For a Representative from the State of Arizona, which is landlocked, which hasn't experienced the perils of such oil spills to their economy, their workers, or their jobs, keep that in mind.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, yes, I am landlocked by California, but you know the old adage. I am waiting for ocean-front property in Arizona, as the song goes.

Once again, let's take a look at this. When we start talking about offshore assets for the Outer Continental Shelf, there is less jurisdiction with regard to that versus what we do on-shore. If we are giving this type of leverage to States with offshore assets, we ought to be giving those States like Arizona, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Montana more jurisdictions because the law is better on their side than it is with those on offshore.

Once again, I find it interesting that we have a dichotomy here. We are all for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but we are unwilling to look at the resources it takes and where they are derived from to make sure that that is permanently, in perpetuity, funded.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 187 OFFERED BY MS. HILL OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 187 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. HILL of California. 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 272, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 267, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 310, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 310, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 314, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Chair, it is hard to overstate the devastating effects of lengthening fire seasons across the United States, especially in my home State of California.

I represent three diverse valleys in California's 25th Congressional District, across northern Los Angeles and Ventura County, and all of them have had significant wildfires and forest fires in the last year.

In fact, 2018 was the deadliest fire season in California's history. According to CAL FIRE and the National Interagency Fire Center, 8,527 fires burned a total of 1,893,913 acres, the largest area on record.

Not only are these fires larger and more frequent, but they are also hotter and more intense. Soon, the term "fire tornadoes" will be a phrase that many people are familiar with.

My own house was evacuated last summer. We had to trailer my horse and relocate my goats and dogs to my sister's house. My sister's house was evacuated shortly thereafter. Sadly, this is not the first time I or my family has had to evacuate. It has practically become a common occurrence for people in areas like ours.

Two days after I found out that I would be coming to Washington to represent my community, three people died in the Woolsey fire, part of which

burned through my district in Simi Valley.

We have to do more. I am thankful for the opportunity to put forth this amendment that provides additional funds for wildland fire management and hazardous fuels work. I am offering it to highlight the funding that is already in this bill to prepare for, combat, and reduce the risk of future catastrophic wildfires and to make sure we do more.

These funds are critical because when the Forest Service does not have enough fire suppression funds, they have to borrow from mitigation accounts to pay for fire suppression activities. This fire borrowing delays the very activities that improve forest health and reduce wildfire risk.

We cannot simply treat the effects. We have to treat the cause. But prevention takes funding, and that is why this bill and this amendment are so important.

For the first time, this bill includes \$2.25 billion in fire cap adjusted funds. These additional funds ensure that our firefighters will have the resources they need to combat wildfires without fire borrowing, meaning that we will invest in the prevention solutions that we know work.

However, we will only have the cap adjusted funds for 2 years. We must all work together to ensure that any budget agreement includes fire cap adjusted funds for future budget years as well. That is how we can make lasting change on this front.

For my community, for California, and for States across the country experiencing the devastating effects of wildfires, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman from California for bringing it forward.

This bill provides substantial funding to prevent and suppress wildfires. For the first time, this bill includes \$2.25 billion in cap adjusted fire suppression funding, for a total of \$5.2 billion for wildland fire management.

Forest Service research and development is increased by \$10 million to advance the understanding of wildland fires and climate adaptation.

While the administration proposed to eliminate the Joint Fire Science Program, this bill includes funding at the fiscal year 2019 enacted level of \$6 million.

Hazardous fuels is \$27 million more.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues that we only have the fire cap adjusted funds for 2 years. We must ensure that any budget agreement includes the fire cap adjusted funds in future budget years. These critical funds will allow the Forest Service to fight wildland fires without borrowing from nonfire programs.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's efforts to reduce the risk of

catastrophic wildfires, and I support this amendment.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, 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. HILL).

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

Ms. HILL of California. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 190 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 190 printed in part B of House Report 116-119.

Ms. SCHRIER. 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 finalize the proposed revised supplemental "appropriate and necessary" finding in the proposed rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units—Reconsideration of Supplemental Finding and Residual Risk and Technology Review" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on February 7, 2019 (84 Fed. Reg. 2670).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak on my amendment prohibiting funds from being used to undermine the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, or MATS.

These regulations have been implemented by the power sector and have protected children and communities from mercury, lead, arsenic, and other air toxics from power plants for the past 7 years.

Furthermore, the administration's proposal to jeopardize mercury standards isn't even supported by the power industry. They have already spent billions to comply, and major power sectors and labor groups have asked that the standards be left in place and that the EPA does not move forward with its proposal to undermine them.

Finalized in 2012, the EPA recognized the significant public health benefits of MATS. Then, the EPA estimated that MATS would yield up to \$90 billion in public health benefits each year. Now, MATS is fully implemented and has shown to be lifesaving, preventing more than 11,000 premature deaths every year and 130,000 asthma attacks each year.

As a pediatrician, I have seen firsthand the impact of air pollution on our children. Pregnant women and children are particularly vulnerable when they are exposed to heavy metals, which impact the central nervous system with potentially devastating effects on neural development.

What we are talking about here is a known public health risk to millions of people. We cannot abandon a policy that has already been proven to work and save lives. MATS has already been shown to prevent premature deaths, adverse effects on pregnant women and children, and health problems like asthma.

It is critical that we protect our children and families from the well-documented health risks posed by mercury and heavy metals and prohibit taxpayer dollars from being used to roll back these safeguards.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment from the gentlewoman from Washington to block the Trump administration from trying to weaken Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for power plants.

Power plants across the country, as has been pointed out, have already complied with the rule. In fact, they have been doing it since 2012, and it has given huge health benefits.

□ 1630

The power sector opposes what the Trump EPA is trying to do, unions oppose what the Trump EPA is trying to do, and so do States and public health communities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this amendment forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, the EPA's announcement in late December intended to revise the cost-benefit findings behind the MATS aspects and benefits. The Obama-era EPA's own estimate of the cost implementing MATS exceeded its estimate of benefits by 1,233 to 2,400 times, an absurdity papered over by the accounting trick of double counting as co-benefits reductions in non-mercury emissions as though these reductions were already achieved under other regulations.

The financial costs of this implementation are between \$4 to \$5 million annually—no, I am sorry—\$9.5 billion annually.

Once again, the rule hasn't even been put out yet.

Don't you think we ought to be waiting to find out what the actual rule is before we say no go?

Because we don't even know where it goes.

We also want to take a look at catastrophic wildfires. Catastrophic wildfires are the largest aspect in regard to contaminants into the air as we witnessed in hazardous breathing times, particularly in Montana and California. So from that standpoint, I urge a "no" vote against this one because it is premature to actually what the rule is coming out.

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Chairman, I would simply request that my opposition, my colleague, double check his facts. This is well-documented. This is effective. It is cost saving, and the costs have already been paid by the energy sector. This is something that they do not even want to see rolled back.

Mr. Chairman, it protects public health. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. SCHRIER. 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 Washington will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 194 will not be offered.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on amendments en bloc No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) be withdrawn to the end that the question be put de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The request for a recorded vote is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise along with Mr. JOYCE to thank our staff on both sides of the aisle and also our personal offices for all of the work they have done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of increasing the productivity of our national forestland. Somehow, America is the world's number two importer of lumber, and at the same time our forests continue to burn at an unprecedented rate. We need to get our forests back in working order.

The majority provided \$276 million for forest products, which is an increase of \$7 million above the enacted level and \$4 million below the President's budget request.

My amendment would support job growth and increased timber production to support forest health and promote safe communities. This funding is critical to support the President's executive order on forest management that involves a plan to sell 3.7 billion board feet of timber and improve over 1.1 million acres of national forestland to mitigate wildfire risk.

Right now there are 150 million dead trees just in my home State of California. If we don't act now to dedicate more resources toward timber management, we won't have any forest left to manage. Instead, we will be watching them burn, foul the air, and foul our water with ash; and in the meantime, we are still importing wood products.

For example, as a result of the 2018 Carr fire in West Redding, California, which burned approximately 230,000 acres and eight people lost their lives, we also lost the Whiskeytown National Recreation Area encompassing 318 square miles which burned to the ground.

We need to increase the pace and scale of forest production and wildfire mitigation in a way that makes business sense and includes the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, 62 percent of forestlands in my district are federally owned. The remaining private forests in my district generate 73,000 jobs, contribute \$4 billion in manufacturing and sales and supports \$1.7 billion in payroll.

There should be no reason our Federal forests cannot produce the same benefits and results to its employees and community as the private sector can.

Let's focus on protecting public health, creating jobs, enjoying the great outdoors by reducing fire risks, and generating economic growth to rural communities across the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for passage of my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM) having assumed the chair, Mr. HIMES, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3055) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1649

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington) at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1650

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendments en bloc No. 5 offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LARSEN of Washington). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-119 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RUTHERFORD of Florida.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 36 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.

Amendment No. 85 by Ms. STEVENS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 89 by Ms. UNDERWOOD of Illinois.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 105 by Mr. PENCE of Indiana.

Amendment No. 114 by Ms. SPANBERGER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 128 by Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida.

Amendment No. 132 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 133 by Mr. BUCHANAN of Florida.

Amendment No. 135 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 136 by Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon.

Amendment No. 139 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 143 by Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 147 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 148 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 158 by Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 161 by Mr. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 163 by Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

Amendment No. 165 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 167 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 168 by Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 176 by Mr. CARBAJAL of California.

Amendment No. 187 by Ms. HILL of California.

Amendment No. 190 by Ms. SCHRIER of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR.

RUTHERFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 245, answered "present" 1, not voting 6, as follows: