

pursued capabilities to threaten our space assets. Fortunately, our Nation has no shortage of innovative and brilliant men and women in uniform.

Our newest combatant command will harness the creative dynamo of these space warfighters. Congress will give them the authorities and funding they need to triumph in this newest contest of arms. With the infrastructure, industrial base, and personnel already located at Peterson and Schriever Air Force Bases in Colorado Springs, SPACECOM can seamlessly transition into a fully functioning combatant command immediately. This is a great and exciting milestone for our Nation.

ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1146.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1146.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0916

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1146) to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, with Mr. CASTEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 2 of House Resolution 548, and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Today the House of Representatives will take a historic vote to roll back one provision of the Republican tax law that was rammed through the last Con-

gress on a party line vote. In addition to the tax breaks to millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations, there was a provision that mandated oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Today we will take up bipartisan legislation to repeal this drilling mandate, protecting, not just the Arctic Refuge, but the wildlife and the indigenous people who depend on this sacred natural landscape.

I introduced H.R. 1146 earlier this year with my Republican colleague BRIAN FITZPATRICK because we believe, as do 182 other cosponsors of this bill, that there are some places that are simply too important, too special, too sacred to be spoiled by oil and gas development. This is the same basic proposition that we were presented with yesterday when the House passed bipartisan legislation to protect our coasts from offshore drilling. Because the north coast of California is too special to have its fisheries and coastal economy put at risk for the profit of big oil. Because places like the Lowcountry of South Carolina are too special to be spoiled by oil spills. Today we are here to show that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the largest wildlife refuge in the United States is also too special.

The refuge is home to more than 200 different wildlife species, and that includes the Porcupine caribou herd that is a vital source of subsistence for the indigenous Gwich'in people. The refuge is a special place where veterans recovering from PTSD find themselves again. We have heard these voices and many others during Natural Resource Committee deliberations on this bill in a hearing earlier this year. And I thank all of those who testified and have spoken out to help us bring this bill to the floor today.

The question before us is: Will the Federal Government protect this special place and the communities that depend on it or will our Federal Government be responsible for its destruction by auctioning it off to big oil? During this debate, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to ask us and ask the American people to trust this administration to do the right thing.

They are going to say that drilling can be done responsibly. They will ask us to trust a Secretary of the Interior who the GAO has determined violated Federal spending laws during the Trump government shutdown. A secretary who violated his ethics pledge by meeting with his former clients at the U.S. Oil and Gas Association as they were pushing for more drilling on American public lands. And a secretary who continues to shill for his former lobbying clients at every turn.

They will ask us to trust this administration where the leading Department of the Interior official pushing for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge just left public service days ago to start a new job at an oil

and gas company with interests, believe it or not, in Arctic oil and gas development in Alaska. You can't make this stuff up. They will ask us to trust a President, who, armed with a Sharpie, overrules scientists and threatens the jobs of scientists when they speak out.

We need to reject this agenda of big oil and protect America's Arctic from oil and gas drilling. It is time to pass H.R. 1146 and repeal the Trump administration tax laws drilling mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, 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. Chairman, I listened to the presentation of the author of this bill. I have been in this House 48 years. We have been arguing about this ANWR for 40 of those years. We have passed it out of the house 14 times. And by the way, it was established by a Democrat President and a Democrat House to allow the 1002 areas to be explored if Congress said so. And that is what we have done.

Now we have a sponsor from California who doesn't know beans about this business talking about big oil and about Trump. This has been a policy of this Nation to allow drilling there if the Congress spoke, and we did so. Under the tax bill, yes, but 13 times before that this House passed the legislation to have the 1002 explored.

Just keep in mind, we are talking about an area of a 19-million-acre refuge and areas left inside, the 1002 area—the map behind me, if anybody can see that little tiny red dot, 2,000 acres, less than the size of Dulles Airport, less than the size of the Capitol grounds. And yet, we are trying to say, no, no development. We are trying to say that is not right, this is the last pristine area. May I say again, it is not the last pristine area.

We have had approximately 30 years of development in Prudhoe Bay, the same type of terrain, same species of animals, same amount of caribou. In fact, we have more now than we had before after we started drilling. So this bill is a sham. And I listened to this with great interest. I always understand what they are trying to do, and it is also a sham to this Congress. This Congress spoke. It is a sham to this Nation. We are taking time away from what should be done in this Nation. We have sat, frankly, 2 years in this House and have done nothing.

Unfortunately, we have heard also this is a cultural bill, and the Gwich'in supposedly is all this gentleman listens to, doesn't listen to the Inupiat. That to me is important. The people that live there want the drilling. The people at least 150 miles away don't want the drilling, but that is who they are listening to.

So, again, my colleagues, this bill is the wrong step forward for this Nation.

It is not about big oil. It is about the State of Alaska. It is about my constituents, not California; they have enough problems of their own. Just read the papers. So I am suggesting, with respect, this bill should not go anywhere. It may pass today, because there are a lot of people on that side who don't believe in oil. I understand that. But it is wrong to undo what Congress has done. And now I will suggest, respectfully, it is dead. You are wasting our time. It will not go anywhere, that is why I am not going to get really excited and go over there and—never mind.

I would suggest, respectfully, I am going to see the death of this bill a long time before this gentleman is ever in this House again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his restraint. One of the arguments my friend from Alaska invariably makes when we talk about this issue is the proposed drilling area is just a tiny little piece of a great big refuge in a great big State. And it is typically characterized as just a little 2,000-acre postage stamp.

We need to dispel this very inaccurate and disingenuous characterization. It may be 2,000 acres of hard footprint, but it is not 2,000 acres of development all in one place. It is spread out across the coastal plain, which is the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge. And if you want to see what this footprint really looks like, it is not so tiny, folks. When you look at the hundreds of miles of roads and the gravel mining and the gravel pads and the oil rigs and other infrastructure that have to go in, it looks a lot differently than what has been characterized.

So this picture depicts what the true footprint of this little postage stamp development in the Arctic refuge looks like. And I think by any fair measure, it would absolutely despoil the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my friend and great champion of our public lands and of the Arctic refuge.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and allowing me to speak on this.

I was on the Ways and Means Committee that passed the grotesque Republican tax cut. This provision was never debated on a bill that never had a hearing wedged in. The math doesn't work out. It portends that we are going to have hundreds of millions, a billion or more in savings. It is not going to happen. We are talking about a relatively small amount of money, which I am convinced, despite my good friend from Alaska's assertion, this is going to move forward.

The American public opposed it. It is the wrong thing to do. We need to be moving in the other direction in terms of keeping the oil up there in the

ground for climate, but also, for the environment there. I had a chance to visit that area with Governor Inslee and other colleagues and am really impressed with the nature of that. I saw that caribou herd.

This is a treasure. It is much more fragile than one would think, and we are bound and determined to work to support the environmental values, the desire of the American people, our challenges for climate, and to unwind this egregious provision in the Republican tax bill, which, mark my words, will, in fact, be substantially adjusted, if not in this Congress in a subsequent Congress.

I appreciate my friend's forthright approach here. I appreciate the fact that we are focusing the American public on the outrageous provision, that we are fighting to protect the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and dismissing this egregious provision in the Republican tax scam.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle proclaim that they are concerned about the environment, but that does not mean that I am not concerned about the environment or that my colleagues on this side of the aisle are not concerned about the environment.

One of our earliest and most recognized conservationists, Gifford Pinchot, stated that when conflicting interests must be resolved that we should strive to do the greatest good for the greatest number for the long run. Pinchot also wrote that conservation is the application of common sense to the common problems for the common good.

Mr. Chairman, this bill today lacks common sense. I have been to the North Slope of Alaska. We can develop clean, safe, low-cost energy in the world and conserve our public lands and the environment. I would argue that because of our technology and innovation and using clean fuels like natural gas that has allowed the United States to decrease our global greenhouse gas emissions more than any other country in the world.

As we look at this bill today, and we look at the history of what has happened, in 1980 a Democratic-held Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and President Carter signed it into law. That act set aside more than 1.5 million acres for responsible oil and gas development in ANWR itself, nearly 20 million acres in total.

Such a large commitment less than a decade after the Arab oil embargo made logical sense at the time.

□ 0930

However, it took until 2018 for Congress to uphold its word, finally ap-

proving a limited exploration project on 2,000 acres in ANWR. This constitutes less than one ten-thousandth of the total acreage and one one-hundredth of the initial exploration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, in the face of increasing belligerence from Russia and China and an unstable Middle East, Members of this House have a choice. We can choose dirtier foreign energy over responsibly developing a tiny parcel of land already set aside for production.

That inaction, Mr. Chair, is one that demands common sense. It is in the common interest to protect domestic energy. Realistically, 2,000 acres is a small price to pay for our security.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for the greatest good for the greatest number and to vote for the long run. I urge my colleagues to vote for common sense and vote "no" on H.R. 1146.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), the chair of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, as a 35th-generation American, I rise in support of H.R. 1146.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was set aside to protect its unique wildlife, wilderness, and resources. It sustains the Gwich'in Tribe and has for centuries. It is why they call it "the sacred place where life begins."

Oil and gas drilling puts at risk the Porcupine caribou herd, which has sustained tribes for centuries and centuries. It also threatens wolves, polar bears, and migratory birds that live in the refuge. It will release carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, exacerbating the effects of global warming, which have affected Alaska far more than any State in this country.

Republicans slipped this drilling provision into their tax cut bill last Congress. I might add that no tribes had an opportunity to voice their opinions on any of that. Now, this administration is rushing ahead without adequate environmental review or Tribal consultation.

Americans want a smart approach to sustainable energy development, not a careless rush to sell off one of our most iconic and sacred places for short-sighted, destructive fossil fuel production.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand with the Gwich'in, speak up for the animals that live in the refuge, and support this important legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chair, how long must we rely on foreign adversaries for fuel? Utilizing

our domestic resources is essential to a strong economy. Energy dominance on the world stage is our end goal. We will never get there if we continue to cut off access to our own resources.

The truth is, oil and gas production in ANWR benefits our country as a whole, but it is also a key industry for the people of Alaska.

The community of Kaktovik sees the energy sector as a significant source of employment, revenue, and reliable energy. The people, including the local Tribe of Alaska Natives, are incredibly supportive of the continuation of oil and gas production in their community. These people were never consulted by my colleagues at any point in the development of this bill.

Neither was our colleague DON YOUNG, who has represented the needs of the people of Alaska for more than 40 years, who has more experience than everyone who wrote this bill combined. DON YOUNG, the dean of the House, the longest serving Member in Congress, should have been the first person consulted about this legislation was never sought out. Instead, they consulted a Tribe 350 miles away that has nothing to do with oil and gas in ANWR.

To put this in perspective, I live in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Omaha, Nebraska, is about 380 miles away. Can anybody tell me what my opinion would matter in Omaha, Nebraska? I don't spend time there. I don't know what the people there want.

The only assumption we can make as to why a Tribe over 350 miles away was consulted instead of the local community is that my colleagues knew they wouldn't find support in Kaktovik.

This should be an easy decision. There is no reason to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to think about the future of our country and vote "no" today on H.R. 1146.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I know the gentleman does not mean to disrespect or trivialize the interests of an indigenous tribe that for hundreds and hundreds of years has depended on the Porcupine caribou herd, where its calving grounds and the heart of its migratory road is right in the refuge we are talking about. I know the gentleman doesn't mean to disrespect them by suggesting that their voices don't matter, but we believe that the Gwich'in people's voice does matter. Mr. Chair, you are going to hear us stand up for their interests consistently on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act.

After almost 40 years of protection, the Trump administration and the fossil fuel lobbyists that have taken up residence at the Department of the Interior opened up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development. The timing of this decision could not be more irresponsible.

The last thing we should be doing is expanding fossil fuel development in the Arctic, where temperatures are rising twice as fast as the rest of the United States. But we know that this administration isn't concerned about protecting our environment or addressing the climate crisis, so it is not surprising that it is willing to sacrifice the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge's diverse habitat in an attempt to help its Big Oil friends turn an even bigger profit.

The American people disagree. The vast majority of Americans oppose drilling in this iconic landscape, and I am proud to stand with them.

We should be reducing our dependence on fossil fuels, embracing renewable energy, and leading the world in combating climate change, not going backward.

Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, environmentally responsible development of ANWR will increase America's energy security and independence, create jobs, and provide affordable, reliable energy for consumers while providing much-needed revenue to both the State of Alaska and the Federal Government.

While congressional authorization is required by law for any leasing in ANWR, I, along with my Republican colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee, believe that Alaska Natives should be able to exercise their right to develop minerals on their lands if they so choose.

As the gentleman from Alaska has pointed out, Native Alaskans who actually live within ANWR fully support responsible development of their local energy resources.

Who do we listen to? The people who actually live there or extreme environmental activists here in Washington?

The oil and gas sector has historically served as a significant source of employment, revenue, and reliable energy for Alaska and Alaska Natives, and supports over 110,000 direct and indirect jobs.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which, fortunately, will never become law.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chair, listen to "the people who actually live there." I wish we had seen that same concern yesterday when we had a chance to vote on banning offshore drilling in places where Governors, mayors, and overwhelming majorities of actual residents don't want to see their pristine coastlines and their coastal economies despoiled by oil and gas development.

I am afraid that my friends sometimes have a selective sense of hearing, but the one consistent voice that always seems to be heard is that of Big Oil.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), my friend and the chair of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative HUFFMAN for his leadership on this very, very important bill.

I would like to discuss briefly one idea, and that is the idea that you hear around that if we are going to protect ANWR, that somehow is going to hurt our ability to become energy independent, that we cannot be energy independent unless we open up ANWR, and that right now, we have to really worry because we are going to become, by not opening ANWR, more beholden to the Russians, to Saudi Arabia.

This is all going to be whether we open up ANWR or not? This is absolute nonsense.

Republicans and this administration no longer care about energy independence. Let's be clear. They do not care about energy independence, and they haven't for years, ever since they voted to lift the oil export ban.

For so many years, we said that we care about energy independence, and we are not going to export our oil and gas. If energy independence was the goal, we wouldn't be letting companies send American-produced oil all over the world, particularly when we are still importing from other countries, yet that is exactly what is happening today.

We export over 3 million barrels a day. Yet at the same time, we are importing 7 million barrels a day.

If oil development, what we are hearing today, is really about making America energy independent, instead of exporting those 3 million barrels, we could keep them here at home.

If Republicans want to put the export ban back in place, then we should have a real discussion. I would love to have that discussion, but they know that their friends in the oil and gas industry would never let them have that discussion because this is all about profits.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, this is all about profits. It is not about energy independence.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I stand in opposition to this legislation, as it hamstring U.S. energy production and goes against the will of the people.

Tax reform not only delivered on the tax cuts for the country and propelled our record-breaking economy, but it paved the way to further energy dominance by authorizing the development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Specifically, there is an area in the NPR that has reserves designated in 1980 by a Democratic Congress to be opened up for gas and oil lease sales.

Before tax reform and the opening of ANWR, 92 percent of the 19.5 million

acres could not even be legally touched. This area was set aside by the 1980 Congress and was limited to 2,000 Federal acres. That is just 0.0001 percent of ANWR.

I heard an analogy the other day. It is like the size of a football on a football field. It is a very, very small spot. I heard another analogy, the size of a postage stamp on a wall.

This was set aside for energy production. It has the resources, and it is time for us to develop those resources because the failure to develop the resources we have in this country to meet the energy needs of our Nation means that we continue to be dependent on other nations.

We think about the Middle East when we think about that, but as I told a story yesterday, the New England States get natural gas from Russia. An LNG tanker that showed up at Boston Harbor provides natural gas to an American State.

That means they are relying on Russia. That is hard for me to fathom when we have an abundance of natural gas in this country, when we have an abundance of oil in this country both offshore and onshore.

These are American resources that should be developed, with a very minimal impact on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is time for America to develop the resources God gave us when He blessed this great Nation, develop these resources in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is the law of the land right now. It is time to develop.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chair, we have addressed this postage stamp canard that we often hear. This is the postage stamp. It is spread out throughout the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. It is the world's biggest postage stamp, if it is a postage stamp, and it would certainly despoil the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge.

□ 0945

Let me just briefly address this other canard, the idea that Congress set aside the 1002 area of the refuge for oil and gas development. If we actually read the law, it was set aside for a study by the Department of the Interior that would determine if it makes sense to open up the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge to oil and gas development.

And here is an inconvenient fact: The Department of the Interior actually found that this is a uniquely vital natural resource that could be dramatically harmed. That is why, for over 40 years, Congress has declined to take the step that that law envisioned of opening it up to oil and gas development. That is, until the last Congress, when it was slipped in on a party-line vote against the wishes, frankly, of even many of my friends across the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1146 and protecting one of our Nation's greatest treasures from becoming the spoils of an industry that recklessly puts profits ahead of risks to the environment.

After nearly four decades of protection, earned by virtue of its diverse wildlife habitats and scenic wonders, the Trump administration wants to sell off the heartbeat of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to the highest bidders. Buried in the small print of a tax giveaway, the President removed critical habitat protections with the stroke of a pen, leaving more than 250 wildlife species, like the polar bear, exposed to potential disaster at the hands of the oil industry.

This action is not only a complete failure of the government's stewardship of these natural habitats, but completely unnecessary, considering the United States is already the world's largest producer of petroleum. Why threaten a fragile ecosystem that is already under terrible threat from climate change?

We owe it to the planet, to future generations of Americans, and to the two-thirds of American people who are opposed to drilling in this iconic landscape to pass this protection act.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, as painful as it is to listen to all of that nonsense on the other side, I am glad to have logical people speak on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, it is great to be out here with my friends on both sides of the aisle. As many know, I have announced I am not going to run for reelection. One of the successes is because of what Chairman YOUNG was able to do in the last Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I don't want to debunk the view. Alaska is bigger than the whole continental United States. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a small area where no one is at. I have been there. I hope you get there. It is a flat coastal plain. This would be like putting a drilling rig that is the size of a football field on the State of South Carolina. We can't debunk those arguments.

My father-in-law worked on the pipeline. He was a communications microwave guy. There are thousands of jobs.

Also, an insidious part of this plan is we know that the pipeline has to have oil in it to flow. We know that we need to continue to have exploration up there so that there is enough oil to keep that pipeline operating.

My friends in the environmental left organizations want to shut down the pipeline. This will make sure it doesn't get shut down.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the chair of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of

the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee for the time and for his longstanding leadership on this issue. And also, I thank the 182 Members of Congress who support H.R. 1146.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly support this legislation, H.R. 1146, a bill to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from the irreversible impacts of oil and gas drilling.

This bill would undo a particular terrible provision that was slipped into the 2017 Republican tax bill with no debate in this Chamber, no amendments in this Chamber, and no votes in this Chamber.

The Republican Party was not content with merely giving trillions of dollars of tax cuts to the wealthiest companies and individuals in this country, tax cuts that have driven us deeper into debt without any of the positives the bill sponsors promised; at the same time they were handing out trillions of dollars to their friends and donors, they threw in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for their oil and gas buddies. They promised that this would be done right, as if destroying a pristine wilderness and threatening the survival of an entire Tribe's way of life can ever be done right.

But then the Trump administration took over. Since then, we have had rushed environmental reviews so they could try to get a lease sale done in 1 year, 2 years quicker than the schedule laid out in the tax bill.

We have seen evidence of the concerns of career scientists being ignored or overridden, and we have seen the Assistant Secretary in charge of making this lease sale happen jump ship and, after a long 3-day cooling off weekend, start at an oil company that has leases right next to the refuge.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should never have been opened, and even those who want to see it develop should recoil at the idea that this is now in the hands of Donald Trump and his buddies.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has nothing to do with national security, has nothing to do with gas prices, and has nothing to do with energy independence. It has to do with greed, plain and simple.

This administration simply can't stand the idea that there are some places that the oil and gas industry shouldn't be allowed to destroy. They can't believe that there are some places that deserve to be protected. They can't imagine there being anything more important than profits.

I don't agree. At some point, we have to say: Stop. You have enough.

We are the number one producer of oil and gas in the world, and production is going up.

The administration is repealing regulations left and right and reduced land or wildlife protections on over 150 million acres of public land. The oil and gas industry has enough. They shouldn't get the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman YOUNG for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this Democratic messaging bill, H.R. 1146, a harmful attempt to undermine responsible energy development.

Throughout the history of our country, we have observed a pattern of politicians in Washington and the East and West Coasts legislating based on what they think is best for the folks in the rest of the country. As we have listened to debate today, we can clearly see that this Washingtonian habit is alive and well.

My good friends on the other side of this issue think they know better than the Alaska Natives living within ANWR; they think they know better than those who would benefit from job growth; they think they know better than the unions; and they think they know better than the people closest to the project.

I urge my colleagues to take a step back and look at the unsettling trend that is occurring throughout this country of outsiders with a tenuous grip on the truth imposing their will on the people really impacted by these local projects.

For instance, in my home State of Minnesota, the same thing is happening with the replacement of Line 3. People from the Twin Cities who are unimpacted by this project are launching efforts right here in this Chamber to stop the replacement and stop the job growth and economic development that would accompany it. Instead of putting our laborers, operating engineers, teamsters, and construction workers to work, they support legislation that is undermining these jobs.

These projects are meant to develop our natural resources to ensure our energy independence and not reduce our reliance on foreign and hostile nations to this country. We responsibly develop our energy with the strongest environmental standards and labor standards in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Let's listen to those affected directly by these projects and do what is right.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of this bill as someone who has had the privilege of spending 2 weeks in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge 15 years ago. It was a life-changing trip.

ANWR's beauty and majesty are almost beyond description. Paddling down the Kongakut River and along the shore of the Beaufort Sea, my companions and I experienced an astound-

ing wealth of plants and animals in a mix unique to the region, a truly iconic corner of our Earth.

Anyone who says it is an empty place or that there is nothing there is committing a sacrilege as far as I am concerned. It is a sacred place to me, and it is no wonder that it is a sacred place to the Gwich'in people.

The Arctic is warming twice as fast as the rest of the United States. Drilling in ANWR would exacerbate that regional effect as well as hastening catastrophic warming, generally.

In short, we must prevent this administration's reckless effort to open up ANWR to oil and gas development to prevent dangerous biological, cultural, and climate impacts. We simply cannot allow this to happen on our watch.

I would point out that, when I paddled down the Kongakut River, I visited these places that are planned for drilling. We were literally hiking along the plain and we came upon these drill pads. It would be outrageous to drill in these places where there are nesting grounds for birds and homes to other animals that just don't exist anywhere else.

I invite any of my colleagues who have the ability to travel on their own power paddling and hiking to join me in going back to ANWR. I don't think they would want to drill there if they did.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman HUFFMAN for his leadership on this, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

I wish I could say that I am surprised by the bills that are being brought before us this week, but I am not. The Democratic war on our economy, on America's families, and on fossil fuels continues.

Mr. Chairman, energy independence is crucial for our economy and our security. I stand in strong solidarity with my friend and colleague from Alaska, someone who is a mentor not just to me, but to all on our side of the aisle.

Partly, I stand in solidarity with him because I, like Mr. YOUNG, represent my entire State. Like Alaska, Wyoming is no stranger to outsiders thinking they know what is best for us.

The legislation we have before us today echoes the majority's goal of making the Green New Deal a reality, fundamentally changing our way of life by making us increasingly dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I joined my colleagues, Whip SCALISE and the House Committee on Natural Resources ranking member, Mr. BISHOP, to introduce the American Energy First Act.

Our bill would end unnecessary overreach from Washington bureaucrats and enable States to manage energy production on lands within our borders. Our all-of-the-above pro-energy legislation would help put our families to work, further our energy independence, and put our national security at the forefront.

Wyoming prides itself on our fossil fuels. We know that our economy and that our security depends on these. We consider our fossil fuels to be national treasures, and, Mr. Chairman, we thank God for our fossil fuels.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today to oppose this misguided anti-energy independence and anti-national security agenda that the Democratic majority has continued to put before us, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not about energy independence. If my friends across the aisle were concerned about energy independence, they certainly wouldn't have lifted the crude oil export ban in the previous Congress. And if they wanted to talk about putting that crude oil export ban back in place, we would have something to work together on and we could actually take a step towards energy independence.

But the truth is we are awash in oil right now. We are exporting millions of barrels of oil a day while we continue to import all that big bad imported oil that sometimes my friends across the aisle are concerned about.

□ 1000

What this is really about, is money and profits for Big Oil. They make a lot more money when they can export that oil on the world market. That is why, when we talk about developing the coastal plain of the Arctic refuge, no one should be confused by these claims that that oil would go to American consumption. It won't.

It will find top dollar on the global export market because that is where Big Oil can make the most money, and that is what the agenda we have heard about is really all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Representative from Alaska for yielding me the time.

I want to say it again. I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska, the sole Member representing all Alaskans in the House of Representatives, who joins with his Senators, the entire Alaska delegation, in opposing this bill.

I heard Mr. STAUBER come down earlier and talk about how we don't need people from other States, from California coming in and imposing their beliefs on Alaska. We have a Constitution. We have a structure here where

Members from the State of Alaska, residents from the State of Alaska, they elect their Representatives. And their Representatives are unanimously supporting the development in the ANWR. They unanimously support it.

Why do we have this structure where other people come in? It is fascinating to me that we can be here and have folks from California sit there and all the time ask for exemptions, ask for exceptions, ask for their own conditions or rules in California, and then they now come in and they know better, and they need to tell Alaskans what needs to be done.

I just heard allegations that this was about oil company profits and other things. This is about what the citizens of Alaska want, what their elected Representatives are doing to represent their own constituents.

Now, to give you an idea of how much of a farce this whole thing is, do you realize that this is the third bill that is using the same funding stream to pay for everything? We have taken \$1 and we paid \$3 with it. How do you do that? This entire thing is a farce.

To take it a step further to let you know what a farce this is, when this bill came up in the Natural Resources Committee, I offered an amendment that said that if this bill results in greater greenhouse gas emissions, then this bill doesn't take place. It is not enacted.

Do you know that my Democrat friends voted against it, meaning they want greater emissions and greenhouse gases, my environmentalist friends? This whole thing is a farce. This is going to result in greater dependence upon foreign oil imports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. YOUNG for yielding me more time.

This is going to result in greater dependence on imports of energy. We have seen it over and over again. We had career officials sit right in front of us in the Natural Resources Committee and testify that when you stop domestic production, that you become more dependent.

Look upon my friend's own State of California that has become increasingly dependent upon oil from Saudi Arabia, increasing their imports of oil from Saudi Arabia. Look at our friends up in the northeast that had to import natural gas from Vladimir Putin's Russia and burn heavy heating oil to help to warm the homes in the northeast because they similarly cut off their energy supplies.

This makes no sense whatsoever. We are doing it under the auspices of an environment that this very bill threatens.

Mr. Chair, I urge rejection of this legislation, and rejection of this entire farce process.

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

We just heard some pretty high sanctimony about the need to listen to the people who actually live there. That might be convincing but for the fact that just yesterday, my friends voted to override the wishes of the people who actually live on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, the wishes of their Governors, their mayors, overwhelming majorities of their populations, who don't want to wreck their pristine coastlines and put their coastal economies at risk because of oil development.

So, again, let's not pretend that this is about listening to local voices. This is about listening to one voice, and that is the voice of Big Oil.

Let's take it back to Alaska. Even in the hotbed of oil development, as my friends would tell it, in the village of Kaktovik, a 2016 poll in that community indicated that that community itself is divided on the question of whether oil and gas development should proceed.

So, again, let's not be selective or hypocritical about the voices we claim to care about. Certainly, the voice of Big Oil is well-represented here today in this debate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I served as the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and now serve as the top Republican on the Energy Subcommittee.

In those years, I helped develop, promote, and implement a North American energy independent plan, and it includes all of the above—yes, renewable energy as well.

I can remember the gas lines. I can remember paying higher prices for natural gas. I can remember \$4 and \$5 per gallon gas prices. And I can remember sending \$1 billion every day to the Middle East.

I smiled this last weekend when I filled up for \$2.25. I smile now when I know that we can export rather than import oil from places that may not be so friendly to the United States.

So if this bill passed, as well as the other two that passed yesterday and somehow became enacted into law, we have this thing called supply and demand. And guess what? Our consumers will pay much higher gas prices and we will lose out. So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague from Alaska, the Dean of the House here, Mr. YOUNG, for his strong efforts for many years on opening up this important piece of en-

ergy for our country and for our whole grid.

It is fascinating to listen to the debate here. Every piece of land, everything we would ever go to develop, whether it is for a pipeline, for energy, for forestry, the moment somebody approaches that resource, these God-given resources we have all over this country, it now becomes this pristine, untouchable, non-usable land that we shouldn't have anything to do with as humankind.

Salvage logging after a fire, oh, we can't do that. We have to sue over that. So we hear a lot about Big Oil.

How about big enviro? There are a lot of people who make a lot of money, six-digit numbers and more, in this town, a lot of dollars that come in by invoking a picture of an animal who probably was a victim of a fire in a forest because we are not managing that.

We have 47,000 acres of burning fire right in my district, in Plumas County in northern California, because we are not allowed to go out and manage these lands.

Almost everybody here in this Congress that lives more than a few hundred miles away flew here by a jet to get to this place to do this session. So where is the hypocrisy being talked about with the amount of energy everyone uses?

Energy has to come from somewhere, Mr. Chairman, for us to live as we do, to keep the lights on in this place, to keep it cool in here, to keep it warm in the winter—especially in the northeast where it is extremely cold. Oil is needed. Energy is needed.

We need to develop it in this country. We hear: We are exporting oil. We are importing oil. Well, there are different types of oil for different types of purposes, too. You have different types of food you exchange for different recipes. We have different types of oil and different types of energy.

Do we want to be relying on or have our European allies relying on Iranian oil? Is that what we are asking here? Do we want them to be relying upon Russian natural gas in our European theater? No. We need to be part of that matrix, the United States. If we are an exporter or self-sufficient, we need to be active on this.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, we know how to ecologically do it well. This isn't 1850. We are not going to go out and do horrible environmental damage. We know how to do this right and we will be responsible. When that resource is done being used someday, we are going to put it back how it was.

We need to develop within our own country under our own rules, instead of having the arrogance of relying on other countries who do it without rules, such as China, such as the Middle East, and others that don't have

our best interests or even the environment at heart.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy on this bill which indicates that the President's advisers would recommend that we veto it, even though it is unlikely that it will ever get to his desk.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 205—PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT OF 2019—REP. ROONEY, R-FL, AND 18 COSPONSORS

H.R. 1146—ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT—REP. HUFFMAN, D-CA, AND 182 COSPONSORS

H.R. 1941—COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT—REP. CUNNINGHAM, D-SC, AND 51 COSPONSORS

The Administration opposes H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019, H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, and H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act. These bills would undermine the Administration's commitment to a prosperous American economy supported by the responsible use of the Nation's abundant natural resources. Development of our resources enhances our energy security and energy dominance, and produces high-paying American jobs; provides increased revenue to the Treasury, States, tribes, and local communities; and is a critical source of conservation funding.

H.R. 1146 would prohibit the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management from administering an oil and gas leasing program in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska. The bill would repeal a provision of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 that directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program for the development of the Coastal Plain that would allow the use of no more than about 0.01 percent of the total acreage of ANWR for surface development of production and support facilities. The Administration supports environmentally responsible energy development in the Coastal Plain, also known as the 1002 Area, of ANWR. Such development is expected to increase America's energy security and independence, create jobs, and provide affordable, reliable energy for consumers while providing much-needed revenue to both the State of Alaska and the Federal Government.

Similarly, H.R. 205 and H.R. 1941 would both restrict future oil and gas development in the Federal waters of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). H.R. 205 would amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) to make permanent the current temporary leasing moratorium on offshore leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, off the west coast of Florida. H.R. 1941 would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) to permanently remove from consideration acreage for offshore leasing on both the Atlantic and Pacific OCS. Both of these bills would undermine OCSLA, which established a periodic, multi-stage planning process involving State and tribal consultation and a thoughtful comparison and balancing of the benefits and impacts to all the regions of the OCS. These bills would permanently constrain this careful administrative process. Under the bills, large swaths of the OCS would be off limits for resource development without the benefit of periodic assessments of the potential economic, social, and

environmental effects of development, as required by existing law. Excluding these areas from leasing consideration could place more pressure for development on other OCS areas and constrain our ability to meet national energy needs as required by OCSLA.

Additionally, each of these bills would eliminate the potential for future direct revenue that would otherwise be provided to the Treasury, and through revenue sharing, to the States, tribes, and counties where the development activities occur. In Fiscal Year 2018, energy development on Federal and Indian lands and waters generated approximately \$9 billion in direct revenue from royalties, bonus bids, and rents. Of that revenue, \$1.78 billion was disbursed to 35 States. The top States receiving Fiscal Year 2018 revenues were New Mexico (\$634.9 million); Wyoming (\$563.9 million); Colorado (\$112.5 million); Louisiana (\$91 million); and Utah (\$76 million). Additionally, more than \$1 billion was disbursed to Indian tribes and individual Indian mineral owners; \$1.22 billion to the Reclamation Fund; \$970 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF); \$150 million to the Historic Preservation Fund; and \$3.5 billion to the general fund of the Treasury.

Prohibiting energy development in new Federal areas would hinder future administrations' efforts to make up for revenue lost as production declines from leases in aging energy fields. Such restrictions will tie the hands of future administrations and reduce their ability to enhance energy security through strong domestic energy production and to ensure affordable energy for American families.

If these bills were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend he veto them.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I also insert in the RECORD a letter in strong opposition to this bill signed by over 20 entities, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Consumer Energy Alliance.

SEPTEMBER 5, 2019.

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We rely on American made energy to power our daily lives, communities and to grow a more prosperous future. Americans deserve clean, safe, reliable, abundant and affordable energy so that our families, communities and businesses can all share the opportunities American energy creates. Our country cannot afford to block access to new energy supplies and risk losing our energy advantage. That's why we ask you to oppose legislation being considered by the U.S. House of Representatives next week that would slow scientific surveys and prevent access to new sources of American offshore energy in the Outer Continental Shelf.

For more than seven decades, energy development in the Gulf of Mexico has worked collaboratively alongside tourism, fishing and Defense Department training activities. But H.R. 205 would permanently extend the eastern Gulf of Mexico moratorium on oil and natural gas activities. The Congressional Budget Office conservatively estimates that this could cost taxpayers \$400 million in revenue over the next 10 years. Similarly, H.R. 1941 would block offshore energy development in the Pacific and Atlantic planning areas, and H.R. 1146 would lock up energy resources in the Alaskan Coastal Plain.

Congress should support progress. Modern energy technologies have enabled an impressive record of environmental stewardship and innovation. But when the government chooses to arbitrarily and permanently close

off areas to exploration and potential development, we simply increase our dependency on foreign sources. This reality is visible in places like California and Massachusetts. Despite abundant offshore oil and natural gas resources, California imports 57 percent of its oil supply, a staggering 37 percent of which comes from Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, to meet energy needs each winter, Massachusetts imports liquefied natural gas from Russia.

American energy is produced with a smaller carbon footprint under significantly stronger environmental protections than energy produced anywhere else in the world. We ask you to embrace these homegrown opportunities that benefit American families, create high-wage jobs, strengthen the U.S. economy and protect our environment.

Next week, the House of Representatives is expected to consider legislation undercutting domestic energy security and economic opportunity by limiting American energy access. We urge you to reject these bills and instead stand up for energy produced in America, by American workers for the benefit of American families.

Sincerely,
American Chemistry Council, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Gas Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Pipeline Contractors Association, Consumer Energy Alliance, Distribution Pipeline Contractors Association, Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

International Association of Drilling Contractors, International Association of Geophysical Contractors, Laborers' International Union of North America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Ocean Industries Association, National Utility Contractors Association, Offshore Marine Service Association, Portland Cement Association, Power and Communication Contractors Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Oil and Gas Association.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I also insert in the RECORD a letter of opposition from the Laborers' International Union of North America.

LiUNA!,
September 9, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LiUNA), I want to express our opposition to H.R. 205, which would permanently extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico; H.R. 1146, to once again prohibit oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR); and, H.R. 1941, which would bar offshore drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

Once again, jobs of LiUNA members who work in the energy sector are being targeted for elimination by environmental radicals for purely political purposes. There is absolutely no chance for these "message bills" to be enacted into law this Congress. So, instead of working to enact real job creating infrastructure legislation, union members see their jobs once again being denigrated and belittled.

Energy independence is central to the future of the American economy and our standard of living. Unfortunately, the enemies of job creation continue to try to wall off and strand our domestic energy resources

from development; killing jobs, prolonging our energy dependence on unfriendly foreign regimes, and saddling middle-class and lower-income families with rising energy costs.

LiUNA members, in Alaska and elsewhere, know first-hand that when done responsibly, with union-trained workers, energy development can coexist with environmental stewardship. LiUNA and the other building trades unions invest significant resources into the training of our members that help develop the knowledge and skills they need to work safely and productively while constructing energy and other infrastructure to the highest standards.

For the hard-working members of LiUNA and other building trades unions, these jobs put food on their families' tables and roofs over their heads. These jobs enable them to put their children through college, to save for retirement, and to spend money in business establishments that employ others.

I urge you to vote against these ill-conceived bills.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD a letter from the president of Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, which is in strong opposition to this legislation.

VOICE OF THE ARCTIC INUPIAT
Point Hope, AK, March 20, 2019.

Congressman JARED HUFFMAN,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE HUFFMAN, Voice of the Arctic Inupiat (VOICE) strongly opposes H.R. 1146 amending Public Law 115-97 to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) oil and gas leasing program. Beyond the fact that your bill would repeal an opportunity that the Inupiat people have fought for decades to achieve, we are struck by the lack of knowledge displayed in this legislation, which completely ignores the existence of the Inupiat people, and especially the people of Kaktovik. The Native Village of Kaktovik is a federally recognized tribe and the Kaktovikmiut have occupied the Coastal Plain for at least 11,000 years.

The Coastal Plain is home to more than just caribou and none of the Coastal Plain is wilderness. It is not a place without people; it never has been—it has been continuously occupied by the Inupiat people and our ancestors for millennia, and we find it insulting that you fail to acknowledge this history. Currently, the Coastal Plain is the home of a community of over 200 people. People who live, hunt, fish, raise their families, and hope for a secure economic future for their children. People who walk in the footsteps of their ancestors all over the land that Congress, without our permission, designated as the 1002 Area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. People that you have completely disregarded because they generally do not agree with you. In light of this, Congressman, your concern about human rights seems a bit pale.

When we, Indigenous peoples, use terms like self-determination, sovereignty, economic equality, cultural survival, and traditional lands, they are more than just buzzwords. These are objectives that have long been denied us and for which we have had to fight for generations. It is not for you to ignore those ideas, nor the people fighting for them, in favor of those who are more aligned with your political agenda. To us, this issue goes beyond politics to the very sustainability of our communities, culture, and economy.

The Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act undermines the wishes of those

of us living closest to ANWR and negates years of work by local stakeholders toward ensuring a sustainable economy for the people and communities of our region. We hope this letter might help you better understand the realities of life in the Arctic. H.R. 1146 preaches a "moral responsibility to protect this wilderness heritage as an enduring resource to bequeath undisturbed to future generations of Americans", but fails to acknowledge the basic needs of future generations of Arctic Inupiat. Our regional government, the North Slope Borough (NSB), is responsible for more territory than any other local government in the nation. The NSB receives over 96% of its revenue from property taxes levied on industry infrastructure on the North Slope, which enables them to provide services that were never accessible before in the Arctic. The Borough School District provides vocational and academic education for people of all ages; NSB health clinics provide modern medical services to residents in even the smallest and most remote of villages. The Municipal Services Department operates water, sewage, and electric utilities, plows roads and runways, and maintains landfills. Other NSB departments provide housing, police and fire protection, search and rescue, and other critical services to our communities. Altogether, the NSB is the single largest local employer on the North Slope, employing over 63% of the workforce. These benefits of modern American civilization, common in the rest of the nation, have been built on the foundation of the North Slope oil industry.

It is hypocritical of you, Congressman, to stifle the efforts of Kaktovik to secure jobs, a local economy, and income for their community while your state makes billions of dollars off the development of its own oil and gas resources. If you are concerned about the impacts of resource development, we suggest that you focus on your own state of California, which despite its green image, produces the dirtiest crude in America and has some of the largest refineries on the West Coast, which in addition to refining much cleaner Alaska North Slope Crude, also imports and refines oil from foreign countries like Saudi Arabia and Angola. The message this bill sends is that you prioritize the leisure whims of your California constituents above the needs of the Native people of Kaktovik.

H.R. 1146 cites climate change as one of the main drivers of the bill. In reality, climate change—and the world's response to it—add additional layers to existing burdens that we, the Arctic's Indigenous people, are facing. We agree that climate change has deeply affected our traditional Inupiat ways of life. We do not agree that the solution to that problem is to create more wilderness that hinders our ability to provide for our people and respond to the impacts that we are facing. It is unfair for you to ask that we, as Indigenous peoples, carry the burden of climate change and the burden of mitigation so that you can fly back and forth to your home district with an easy conscience.

Even with the services our local government provides, many of the people in the Arctic live in conditions that fall below acceptable standards of living, despite being citizens of one of the richest countries in the world. We are concerned and puzzled, then, by your focus on protecting eco-tourism and this idea of pristine, unspoiled wilderness—at the expense of an economy to sustain our children—that rich elites across America "cherish." While we are certainly used to this harmful narrative by now, it does not seem in line with your democratic values. For our part, we do not see any contradiction between developing our resources and at the same time protecting our environment

and wildlife. These are not diverging priorities but an integral piece to balance in the Arctic.

The bill as introduced further ignores the historical and cultural trauma that is a part of this land and the Kaktovikmiut who inhabit it. The people of Kaktovik, in recent memory, have suffered through three forced relocations at the hands of the American military. Then, in 1980, the federal government took 23 million acres of land—without consent, consultation, nor a treaty between parties—and gave the people of Kaktovik back 92,000 acres of land immediately surrounding their village. A mere fraction of their traditional and ancestral lands. The "deal" was that this land was locked up, the Kaktovikmiut were unable to access Native allotments, cultural sites, and subsistence areas in the newly expanded Refuge in the summer months. No, they now live with extreme restrictions on how they can use their own lands as a result of the changes made by the federal government in how the land is designated, lands that the Inupiat people have been stewards over for thousands of years. Do you consider these human rights violations, Representative Huffman? We hope, at the very least, that this does not diminish "the integrity of the National Wildlife Refuge System," which in itself operates on the mistaken Western idea that Indigenous peoples are incompetent at managing their own lands.

The views of the Inupiat who call ANWR home are frequently ignored, and your bill reinforces the perception that the wishes of people who live in and around the Coastal Plain are less important than those who live hundreds and thousands of miles away. Mr. Huffman, you do not have to tell the Inupiat people, who have lived on this land for generations, the importance of our homelands—we see it, we know it, we depend on it, we are a part of it. We have something very important in common, that often gets lost in this debate—this false dichotomy of "for" vs. "against", republican vs. democrat, economy vs. environment—we all share a commitment to protecting this land and we would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with you and the Gwich'in people, to whom we have extended many invitations for discussion, to protect this balance between responsible development and environmental protections that is integral to our way of life and the long-term sustainability of our culture.

The Inupiat people have existed, and even flourished, in one of the most severe climates in the world for generations. We understand the balance needed to sustain our way of life and our communities; this priority is currently dependent on successful and safe oil and gas developments. We are confident that the health of the Porcupine Caribou Herd can be maintained given our success in maintaining the health of three other caribou herds that migrate within our region. We respectfully request that you remove your bill from consideration and come visit our communities to better understand the needs of our people and our communities. We would welcome the opportunity.

Taikuu,

SAYERS TUZROYLUK,
President, Voice of the
Arctic Inupiat.
REX A. ROCK SR.,
Chairman.
JOHN HOPSON JR.,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the former chairman of the committee and ranking member at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I was hoping the gentleman would insert me as well.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity of being here. We are here today on day two of the Democrat week of energy proposals. And once again, we will quote Earl Weaver when he went out to the umpire and said:

Is this as good as it gets, or are you going to get better?

I will say the same thing on this bill as we did yesterday. Is this as good as it gets, or are you actually going to get better?

This is the same concept we had with the first bill that we did. We voted second, but we actually discussed it as the first bill yesterday, in which we did things that are basically illogical, not for science reasons. Science was essentially taken out and shoved into a trash can, but, actually, we did it for political reasons.

It is signified by the amendments that the Rules Committee, unfortunately, made in order in which we made amendments in order to have all sorts of studies on the issue.

In the real world, you would try and do a study, come up with results, and then come up with the policy. That is not what we did yesterday. We decided on a policy, and then we are going to institute a lot of non-comprehensive, skewed studies to try and see if we can come up with arguments in favor of the policy we already did. It is backwards.

It is okay to do it. You have the votes to do it. That is fine. Just don't have the audacity to say that this administration doesn't trust science or that we don't trust science over here, when you also put an amendment in there to deny any kind of seismic research, which would give you the data we haven't had since the 1980s, but only some of that seismic data. It is a skewed approach to it.

But the most significant issue is the one that Mr. HUFFMAN has raised several times today in which he was right—slightly off center with it—but he is actually right.

Yesterday, many of the arguments that were made were that the States and State populations in these areas want a kind of moratorium on drilling in their areas. I get that. Listening to those people is a good thing to do. But where the gentleman got it wrong, though, is that they weren't talking to the States who were wanting that. We are not talking about the areas within their States or even the water that abuts their States as legally theirs. They wanted the ability to control what happens on Federal waters, which is not part of the State's concept.

Once again, if you would allow me the ability to have control of what happens on Federal lands in my State, in the State, we might have an apples-and-apples situation, but that ain't it.

There is also the concept that there was not consultation with Native Americans who live in Alaska and that, once again, is actually inaccurate.

There have been consultations going on since the gentleman was playing volleyball in college. And they will continue to go on from that side.

In fact, that is where the difference comes. The people in Alaska who live there don't want this bill. And, once again, they don't want it because it is impacting their State, their property, their land, which is not what was happening yesterday, where States were trying to impact what was happening on Federal water.

It was sad that when we had the hearing on this bill, the Democrats did not invite those residents of this area to testify. We did. And when they came in March to testify, the Tribal leaders from the only village in this coastal plain, the one that is closest to this area, simply said they were against this bill.

Their exact words were: "The Arctic Inupiat will not become conservation refugees. We do not approve of efforts to turn our homeland into one giant national park, which literally guarantees us a fate with no economy, no jobs, reduced subsistence, and no hope for the future of our people."

□ 1015

That is what they want in their area. When some of the other speakers said there is no consultation, that is not true.

Mr. YOUNG is saying exactly what the constituents want in their area. Even though this land is controlled by Fish and Wildlife, the mineral resources are not Federal. These people who are testifying that they don't want this bill own a majority or a significant portion of those mineral rights. It is their mineral rights, and they should have the ability to say what they want, too. They have spoken clearly year after year.

That is where the difference of yesterday and today is significant, and the gentleman is glossing over that. That is significant.

These people need to have the ability to control their own destiny. They are not trying to control something that is not within the State. It is their resources. It is their area.

We have had this debate before. We had it when I first came here. It is going to continue on ad nauseam.

The problem is this is not a good energy position for the future. What we produced yesterday as Republicans is a program that increases jobs, increases the economy, and makes this country stronger. The stuff the Democrats are putting on in their energy week is disjointed, discombobulated, and doesn't actually help anyone at all.

Once again, Mr. Chair, I agree with Mr. YOUNG. Trust his people on what they want to do with their resources—not Federal—their resources.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, it is important to remember that we are talking about a Federal wildlife refuge, America's Arctic refuge.

Mr. Chair, you would lose sight of that, perhaps, listening to the pretzel

logic we just heard from my friend who at the end of the day cannot square the selective concern for local voices when it comes to drilling in a Federal refuge and yet the flouting of local voices when it comes to drilling, in the Federal interest, the Outer Continental Shelf on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. The disconnect is dizzying.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is one of the Members of Congress who has actually spent some time in the Arctic refuge.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, in 2017, with little debate, the Republican-led Chamber quietly approved a provision to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling. ANWR is our Nation's largest wildlife refuge, and it is the ancestral home to the Gwich'in people and current home to more than 250 species of wildlife, including threatened species like polar bears that raise their cubs there.

As the chairman said, I have traveled to this special place. I have met with the Gwich'in people. I saw the pristine beauty of the coastal plain, and I saw thousands of Porcupine caribou in their annual migration process. I know how important this refuge is to our entire ecosystem.

Instead of protecting this important environment, this administration is going to open it up to drilling and allow it to be destroyed for an indeterminate amount of oil. Why? The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to this plan. They want this land preserved, not destroyed.

This bill, H.R. 1146, will block the administration's disastrous plan and protect the refuge.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this unwarranted legislation. Like the two bills we debated yesterday, this bill is another attempt to hinder American energy dominance and our national security.

As someone who has visited the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, I know the support that responsible energy production in section 1002 has among the local population.

Responsible energy production will provide much-needed employment opportunities to the local population as well as critical tax revenue for local government services. Not only does energy development in section 1002 have the support of inhabitants in the region, but it also has the support of our colleague, Congressman DON YOUNG, and Alaska's two Senators. In addition, the majority of Alaskans support it; every Alaskan Governor since 1980 has supported it; 100 percent of Alaska's congressional delegation since 1980 has supported it; and the Natives who live right there, the village of Kaktovik,

the Inupiat, the proper Tribe that is closest to them and the only Tribe within section 1002, support it.

This bill follows a bad pattern of how Democratic members on the Natural Resources Committee operate. They do not care that local representatives and residents oppose this legislation. They believe that Washington, D.C., and extremist national environmental groups know best and everyone else should just go along with their extremism. And it double-crosses the tax bill passed just last year.

Section 1002 has the potential to benefit greatly our country's energy security. Estimates from the U.S. Geological Survey believe section 1002 contains more than 12 billion barrels of oil, not to make mention of natural gas.

Once again, Mr. Chair, we have an example of the other side putting left-wing extremism and their environmental donors ahead of local voices, our national security, and the needs of the American people. I am a firm believer in an all-of-the-above approach to responsible energy production and multiple use. Our public lands, like section 1002, have nearly unlimited potential to power our country.

Further, we can do all this while protecting the environment. Section 1002 is a small sliver in this area, 2,000 acres, in fact.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, does the gentleman from California have the right to close?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, this is a sham bill. I have heard people say there was no consultation. There has been consultation. The gentleman from California has driven a wedge between two groups of Alaska Natives, one that lives there, resides there, and is directly affected, and the other one is 400 miles away. We had testimony from that group.

By the way, I am a Gwich'in. I may not be one, but my daughters are. My wife was. She would turn over in her grave right now if she heard this nonsense about the Gwich'in.

You invited a group in Alaska. This used to be the House of the people. Instead of people putting their nose in my business, I am going to put it in your business. I will figure out a way to do that because this is wrong. This has been debated for 40 years, an area set aside by this Congress for exploration.

By the way, we gave the Alaska Natives who live there at Kaktovik 70,000 acres of land for their social and economic well-being, and you are taking it away from them. You talk about a cultural aspect, you are hurting those people, and you don't care. I remember who you represent, and I understand that. You are a lawyer.

To me, to have this type of bill on the floor is not only a waste of time for this House body but a bad thing for this Nation, but worse than that is going back on their word.

I represent the whole State of Alaska. The people who live there, live on the Arctic slope, want this legislation, not the Gwich'in. Yes, they are being, very frankly, shilled and used for a sham, and that is a shame.

You can be what you want to be. You can stand there holier-than-thou. You are doing something wrong to this Nation, the Alaska people, and the Alaska Native. You listen to one side.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I have a lot of respect and affection for the dean of the House. I am sorry that we are on opposite sides of this issue. I am also sorry that it seems when it comes to oil and gas development in the Arctic refuge, he is listening to only some of the voices in the Alaska community.

Mr. Chair, this week, dozens of indigent Gwich'in leaders flew all the way to Washington, D.C., as they have done many, many times over the years, long before I started working on this bill. They do that because the Arctic refuge is not simply a policy issue for them. It is not about energy supplies, geopolitics, profits, or scoring political points. It is about their entire way of life.

Those of us on the floor today don't worry that our entire history and our entire culture hinge on the outcome of this vote. But for the people in the gallery today, the Gwich'in who are in the gallery behind me right now, that is exactly what is at stake.

For those on the other side who would have us destroy this wild and sacred area for some petroleum profits, I would ask them this: Why now? Why do we need to do this now? Because once it is done, it is done. The coastal plain will never be the same again after the drill rigs roll in.

If we wait, if we conserve, if we protect, and if we treat this special area with the care it deserves, then it will still be there, wild and undisturbed for future generations to enjoy. Or maybe my grandchildren will still be debating Congressman YOUNG's great-great-grandchildren over this same issue on this very floor.

Do you know what? That is fine. I don't mind the debate. That is what this country is all about. But recklessly throwing open one of the most special places in this country because a few oil companies want even higher profits and President Trump wants a win? That is not fine. That is not worth it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to protect the Arctic, stand with the Gwich'in people, and vote "yes" on the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act.

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

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-30, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 116-200, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1146

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE OIL AND GAS PROGRAM.

Section 20001 of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. INSPECTION FEE COLLECTION.

Section 22 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1348) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) INSPECTION FEES.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall collect from the operators of facilities subject to inspection under subsection (c) non-refundable fees for such inspections—

"(A) at an aggregate level equal to the amount necessary to offset the annual expenses of inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) by the Secretary of the Interior; and

"(B) using a schedule that reflects the differences in complexity among the classes of facilities to be inspected.

"(2) OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the 'Ocean Energy Safety Fund' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fund'), into which shall be deposited all amounts collected as fees under paragraph (1) and which shall be available as provided under paragraph (3).

"(3) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, all amounts deposited in the Fund—

"(A) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

"(B) shall be available for expenditure for purposes of carrying out inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) and the administration of the inspection program under this section;

"(C) shall be available only to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriations Act; and

"(D) shall remain available until expended.

"(4) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For each fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2020, the Secretary shall adjust each dollar amount specified in this subsection for inflation based on the change in the Consumer Price Index from fiscal year 2020.

"(5) ANNUAL FEES.—Annual fees shall be collected under this subsection for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$25,300 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

“(B) \$40,700 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

“(C) \$75,900 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

“(6) FEES FOR DRILLING RIGS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for drilling rigs on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$73,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 500 feet or more; and

“(B) \$40,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

“(7) FEES FOR NON-RIG UNITS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for well operations conducted via non-rig units as outlined in subparts D, E, F, and Q of part 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$29,172 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of 2,500 feet or more;

“(B) \$25,366 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths between 500 and 2,499 feet; and

“(C) \$9,834 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

“(8) BILLING.—The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (5) annually, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (6) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days after billing.”

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

Each further amendment printed in part D of the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike “Section” and insert the following:

(a) Section

On page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

(b) TRIBAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall not take effect until—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior completes a thorough consultation with the Inupiat people regarding the effect of this Act on the

quality of life, human rights, and future of the Inupiat people; and

(2) by formal action Kaktovic Village approves of such repeal.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, 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, we discussed before that this bill was written by the gentleman from California. It only impacts Alaska and impacts it only, and I am the only Congressman. I strongly oppose this legislation.

My amendment, very frankly, was to try to solve one of the problems, the lack of consultation with the people in Kaktovik, the Inuits, and only listen to one side, the Gwich'in.

This amendment says, yes, they will have to consult with the Inuits, and they have to consult with the people of Kaktovik, and it would require them to understand that if they didn't agree with it, very frankly, this would not go forth.

It is a good amendment. If the gentleman says this is culturally real, you have to listen to both sides. You have divided us. This amendment solves that problem.

Adopt this amendment and make this bill a little bit better but not totally good.

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

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this amendment is a stall tactic to delay the bill's protections for the Arctic refuge from taking effect until the Secretary of the Interior—a walking conflict of interest who became the subject of investigations into ethical violations just 4 days into his job—has conducted a “consultation” process and received formal action from one village, the village of Kaktovik. I wish that same concern for Native American community consultation had existed before the Republican tax bill was amended to insert this drilling mandate without any consultation with Native American Tribes, certainly not the Gwich'in people who may technically live a little further away from the drilling area, but we are talking about people who for millennia have depended on the Porcupine caribou herd that absolutely depends on this pristine beating heart of America's Arctic refuge.

□ 1030

So again, we are cherry-picking, I am afraid, which voices matter, which voices get to be listened to, and certainly putting this Secretary of the Interior in charge of that process would be a cruel joke.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Again, might I may say, Mr. Chairman, this bill has been de-

bated. It passed out of this House 14 times—14 times—with consultation.

And with all due respect to my friend from Gwich'in, I would like to take a count of the caribou they have harvested in this last year and the year before. It is a very small number. The people who live there, right on the shores and with them, are saying this is okay.

We developed Prudhoe Bay. We have more caribou now than we have ever had.

This is, again, a sham. It is such a dishonest presentation of something that is not fact at all. But, again, in society, people can do that. I understand that.

But we ought to understand one thing: This bill should never have come to the floor.

Number two, it is not the first time. There was consultation. We did pass it—again, 14 times—out of this House, even when you were in control, and now it is the wrong thing to do. The Senate didn't pass the bill once, and Bill Clinton beat it to death.

So I am just saying, again—not much use talking about it much more—that we can go ahead and vote on this today, but this amendment solves one of the problems: true consultation with two groups of individual Alaska Natives, both having some say in it, one totally not listened to because you have never asked them, and that is an unfortunate thing.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, let's do be careful about the facts.

More caribou than we have ever had before? That is certainly the case for the Porcupine caribou herd, precisely because it has had the benefit of the wilderness management of the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge so critical to its migratory pattern and its calving.

Throughout the rest of the Arctic, caribou are in real trouble. Herds are declining, and a very recent study has confirmed that. So let's take note of the fact that we have one place where caribou are thriving. Let's not wreck that place with oil and gas development.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a 35th-generation American, it is well known that I am deeply committed to ensuring proper consultation with Indian Tribes about Federal policies and laws that impact them.

But this amendment isn't really about Tribal consultation. If it were, Republicans would have insisted on this provision before the Arctic Refuge was added to the tax bill and opened up for drilling. And they would also be insisting on consultation with all Tribes, including the Gwich'in people, who get sustenance from the Porcupine caribou

herd that will be directly impacted by drilling on the coastal plain.

Just because certain Alaska Natives don't "live there" doesn't mean they don't have ancestral ties to the land. And, in fact, this land is imperative to their present and future existence. The real purpose of this amendment is to delay protecting the refuge until this administration is able to give it away to oil and gas companies, when it will be too late.

If we stop the leasing process first, I would fully support a thorough consultation with the Inupiat and Gwich'in people and would look for ways to improve the quality of life of the people of Kaktovik without drilling the Arctic Refuge. We can't drill first and ask questions later, because there is no going back.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I am urging a "yes" vote on this amendment and "no" on the legislation itself.

And, again, I think the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) has done a great disservice to the people of Alaska, especially the natives. He has divided us, and that is not right.

The floor of this House has divided a culture, different cultures, Alaska Natives, and it is for that I am deeply regretful. It shows what you can do when you interfere with other people's districts.

This House used to be a House of the people. Now it is a House of what? What have they done in 2 years? Nothing.

Now they are trying to undo what was done legitimately in 40 years. And so I understand it. You have the votes. I understand that. It is not going to become law. I hope you understand that.

And we are going to have a sale—I hope you understand that—and then my people that I represent will, in fact, get their just due. I know that.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, this amendment is a delay tactic to ensure that the current administration will lock in a lease sale before protections can go into place or before they are finally run out of office.

It does not require consultation with the Gwich'in people, many of whom are here today. These are the folks who consider the coastal plains sacred. They have relied on the Porcupine caribou since time immemorial for their cultural, spiritual, and physical sustenance, as well as food security.

There was no demand for Tribal consultation prior to this little provision being slipped in to the tax giveaway in the previous Congress. What we are hearing today is a very selective interest in consultation that would place the entire process in the hands of a Department of the Interior whose only interest is serving the interests of big oil.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the repeal under section 2 will not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities and women.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that allows the section 2 moratorium in this bill to go into effect when the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Labor, certifies that the anti-energy moratorium in the bill will not kill a substantial number of Tribal, minority, and women jobs.

We heard arguments from Democratic Members on the other side of the aisle against a similar amendment that this amendment doesn't matter and is meaningless. How callous that response. Tell the opponents of this amendment to tell that to the single mother working to put food on the table for her two children that her job doesn't matter.

How about the minority family who just moved into a new neighborhood so their kids could go to better schools? Tell those hardworking minority parents these jobs don't matter.

Tell those local Tribe members, the Inupiat, the only Tribe within the 1002 section who want these jobs, whose prosperity comes to their community with these jobs, that these economic benefits don't matter.

Under the current administration, unemployment has reached record lows. In August, the national unemployment rate sat at 3.7 percent, with the unemployment rate for African American workers sitting at 5.5 percent, breaking the previous record of 5.9 percent, which was set in May of 2018.

According to a recent report by The Washington Post, a bastion of conserv-

ative dictation, nearly 90 percent of the jobs added under this administration have gone to minority communities. This can be attributed to, for the first time, a majority of new hires are people between the ages of 25 and 54 and are from minority communities.

According to statistics published by the American Petroleum Institute, minorities will comprise one-third of the total workforce in the oil and gas sector by 2030. Women already comprise more than 15 percent of the oil and gas workforce.

These are good-paying jobs, \$90,000 and above, that hardworking families depend on. This legislation puts these employment opportunities and associated economic benefits at risk.

America's energy renaissance has boosted the economies of previously left-behind towns in areas and sections of this country and has turned them into vibrant communities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment, protects minority Tribal members and women jobs, and puts the interests of the American workforce first.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I am sorry to say, is another delay tactic in order to buy this administration more time to jam through a lease sale.

We know that former Assistant Secretary Joe Balash said earlier this year that the leased sale will happen in 2019 and that the administration is running over all opposition in order to make that happen, ignoring concerns of wildlife biologists about impacts from seismic testing and oil development itself.

Now, I said "former Assistant Secretary" when I referred to Mr. Balash, because he left the Department of the Interior. Just days ago, he was a top official—remember—pushing for drilling in the Arctic Refuge, and he left to take a job with an oil company that stands to profit from the Trump administration's oil giveaway bonanza.

You can't make this stuff up, folks. Anyone who thought Teapot Dome was the high watermark of corruption at the Department of the Interior I hope is paying attention to the incredible craven levels of corruption that we are seeing today. These are the folks who this amendment would entrust with the authority to call the shots on whether drilling should proceed.

Unfortunately, this is not a serious proposal. I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, how offensive. How offensive that argument, particularly when you look at the Department of Labor. Hardly a bastion in regards to the corruptness, at least in this administration.

Amazing. Amazing that jobs that we see the empowerment of people, taking them away from the victims, victimhood, that Democrats so desperately need, particularly, the Native Americans who are empowered right here with the money and the jobs to lift them out from the poverty that they actually see.

Amazing. Absolutely amazing.

So it seems to me that when you start looking at this application in consultation with the Department of Labor, makes a big, big difference.

Now, when you look at this, American oil and gas production is nearly responsible for 10 million jobs. That is a huge amount of sector. And we discussed earlier that 90 percent of these jobs in this sector are going to women and minorities. That is a fabulous number. That is the American Dream.

This is a commonsense application that Congress has got to get used to to understand the ramifications, the true ramifications of our intent.

Mr. Chair, I ask everybody to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, the impacts on jobs for Native Americans, for minorities, for women, this should not be used as a pretext for more oil and gas drilling, especially in a pristine place like the Arctic Refuge. These are frontline communities that often bear the brunt of pollution and environmental justice impact. And it is deeply cynical to try to suggest that their interest would be a reason to push for more drilling in a place like the Arctic Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues want to work on jobs and the economic interest of these communities, we have got a lot to work together on, but we should do that in a way that looks to the future.

Squeezing a little more fossil fuel out of a special place like the Arctic Refuge is not the future. Developing clean renewable energy resources absolutely is the future. I hope some day we can get to the point of working together to create great, well-paying jobs in those future interests instead of trying to look backward to the era of fossil fuels, which I hope we can bring to an end as quickly as possible.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the repeal under section 2 will not adversely affect Caribou herd populations.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED
BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to Amendment No. 3 Offered by Mr. GOSAR:

Strike "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service".

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman of Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The modified amendment allows section 2 of the bill to go into effect when the DOI, in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, certifies that section 2 of the bill will not harm the caribou herd population.

It has been proven that, over time, the caribou herds of the North Slope can coexist and even thrive with energy development that takes place there.

Many of my Republican colleagues and Members of the Western Caucus have seen this firsthand. We have seen the great lengths that industry and regional governments, Alaska Natives and others have gone through to protect the caribou.

□ 1045

In March of this year, the Tribal administrator of the Native village testified: "Through the use of science and traditional knowledge, best practices have been implemented to reduce or avoid impacts; such as, adequate pipeline height to not impede migrating caribou, sufficient distance between pipeline and road to avoid deterring crossing caribou, specifications on road height and slope, thoughtful design on road placement to avoid funneling migrating caribou, aircraft altitude guidelines, time-area closures, and other restrictions on operations.

"These safeguards have worked to protect caribou across the North Slope,

and we are confident that, through coordination with the people of Kaktovik, these mechanisms can be successfully applied to oil and gas programs in the coastal plain."

In fact, I have seen that the pipelines that go through the area occupied by the caribou herd are now 10 to 15 feet in the air, allowing the herds to easily pass underneath them to facilitate migration and breeding. And this was done voluntarily, at the industry's expense.

Statistics have shown that the caribou herds that inhabit areas in and around areas where oil and gas production is taking place have actually grown in size; whereas, herds that have inhabited areas where no oil and gas activity has taken place have actually declined.

Yes, we have heard the false narrative from the other side today and over the years that caribou populations are declining and oil and gas production is to blame. That is simply not true.

For example, the Porcupine herd located within the proposed development has fluctuated greatly, even without the oil and gas development taking place. From 1989 to 2001, the Porcupine herd population decreased by nearly one third, even while no oil and gas production was taking place on the lands they inhabited.

This stands in stark contrast with the central Arctic caribou herd which inhabits lands adjacent to ANWR, where oil and gas development takes place.

The central Arctic herd grew from 5,000 caribou in 1975, about the time development began, to almost 32,000 in 2002.

In short, oil and gas production has proven to be good for the central Arctic caribou herd, and breeding caribou have even been found to migrate toward the pipelines due to the heat they put off.

The other side uses the caribou herds that live in the ANWR region as political pawns to try and prevent energy development in the area.

Again, statistics show that the caribou herd populations can benefit with responsible oil and gas development.

This amendment challenges the false narrative that has clearly been disproven with the population explosion of the central Arctic caribou herd in oil-and-gas-producing areas.

Further, this commonsense amendment provides further protection for caribou herds by ensuring this bill won't negatively impact these populations.

Mr. Chair, I urge everybody to vote for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, this is, unfortunately, another delay tactic intended to enable this administration to

rush through oil lease sales in the Arctic refuge.

And now I am afraid my friends across the aisle are really stretching. This argument that oil development is good for caribou is something we have heard before. It has been debunked every single time we hear it.

But, if you really want to see the craven nature of this proposal, focus on the fact that the person who would make the decision, who would strike that balance between oil drilling and caribou protection, is none other than the Secretary of the Interior, David Bernhardt, an oil and gas lobbyist who temporarily left the payroll of the oil and gas industry for a little time in public service and has never stopped representing their interests. And we all know that, a year and a half from now, he will be right back on Big Oil's payroll.

So this is not a serious argument. This is a delay tactic.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, once again, we are going to debunk the flawed science that the other side looks at.

Mr. Chair, I have two different articles that have been peer reviewed, and I include them in the RECORD.

CARIBOU CALVES AND OIL DEVELOPMENT—DO THEY MIX?

(By Patti Harper)

One thing's certain about day-old caribou calves. "They are incredibly cute," says Steve Arthur, a biologist with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Fairbanks. Arthur and his research partner, Patricia Del Vecchio, have gotten up close and personal with newborn calves of the Central Arctic caribou herd each June since 2001, in an effort to address an important question: What is the effect of oil field development on wildlife?

Arthur says data they have collected suggest that when cows are displaced from preferred calving areas, their calves are smaller at birth and may not grow as fast or survive as well. It's an important finding because some of the calving and summer ranges of the Central Arctic caribou herd overlap areas of oil development on Alaska's North Slope.

The herd's size increased from approximately 5,000 caribou in 1975, about the time development began, to almost 32,000 in 2002. But Arthur says no easy answer can be gleaned about whether development has affected the herd from looking at changes in the overall number of caribou, because many factors affect growth or decline of caribou populations. Previous researchers have drawn contradictory and controversial conclusions about whether and how much caribou are affected, he said.

When the study started, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and other management agencies had been encouraging oil field developers to minimize impacts and activities in calving areas, but wanted better data. "My interest is in trying to cut through some of the controversial aspects of some of the previous work that has been done and come up with something concrete and measurable," Arthur said. The goal has been to identify and measure the mechanisms through which development disturbance might affect the caribou population, such as by reducing body condition, reproductive success or calf survival.

The Bureau of Land Management and ConocoPhillips contributed major funding for the project, and the National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also provided support.

Arthur and his team spent five years measuring calves, and radiotracking cows and calves, to learn more about such things as preferred calving areas, feeding ranges, and calf survival. Each year, they captured 60 to 65 calves during the two-week calving season in June, fitted them with radio collars, weighed them and measured metatarsus (lower leg bone) length. These calves were then located by radio signal every two weeks through October, and the following March and June, to find out how many calves survived. Calves were captured, weighed and measured when they were three and nine months old. Over the course of the study, 58 cows were fitted with Global Positioning System (GPS) collars that provided locations for them every five hours from May through October, and every two days from November through April.

The work was exciting, but it wasn't easy. The team had to hope for good flying weather during what could be a somewhat wintry and blustery June. It was important, Arthur says, to measure calves within a couple of days of their birth. Having some older than others would make it difficult to compare data. Also, at three days old, calves can run pretty fast, making them difficult to catch. The newborns were caught by hand—the helicopter landed, Arthur or Del Vecchio jumped out, grabbed a calf, collared and measured it, and then left as quickly as possible so its mother, watching from nearby, could return.

Netting rather than drug-darting was used to capture older caribou because animals from the herd are an important food source for residents of the area. Skilled net-gunners leaned from low-flying helicopters to release the nets. Caribou caught in the nets were then hobbled and blindfolded to calm them and again, the process of collaring, weighing and measuring took just a few minutes before the caribou were released.

In their recently published interim research technical report, "Effects of Oil Field Development on Calf Production and Survival in the Central Arctic Herd," Arthur and Del Vecchio compare what happened to calves that were born in two different calving areas, an area that is in a mostly undeveloped area east of Prudhoe Bay, and an area west of Prudhoe Bay that has seen increasing development since the late 1980s. In the western area, calving has shifted south since development began, though the researchers point out that it is unclear if the shift resulted from development, increased herd size, or other factors.

The researchers found that newborns from the western area on average weighed a little less and were slightly smaller than those from the eastern area, and that these differences persisted through at least the first nine months of life. They also found that calves that were heavier in September were more likely to survive the following winter. However, statistically, survival rates did not differ between the areas—depending on the year, 53 to 87 percent of calves that were alive at the end of the calving period survived to the end of their first year. The researchers say it is hard to detect small differences in survival rates, and other research has shown that small differences can have significant effects on caribou population trends.

Arthur and Del Vecchio conclude that the differences in size and mass of calves may be largely influenced by the quality of habitat and forage available to cows during the calving period. "Thus, displacement of car-

ibou cows from preferred calving habitats may reduce fitness and survival of calves," they wrote.

As oil exploration and production continue, the approach set out in this research may help to provide solid answers to the question of whether development does or does not adversely affect caribou populations. Arthur and Del Vecchio explain it this way in their interim report: "If further increases in levels of anthropogenic disturbance cause caribou to reduce their use of preferred habitats, it should be possible to detect effects of these changes by measuring birth weights and growth rates of calves. If similar changes do not occur in less-disturbed areas, then this may be taken as evidence of possible effects of disturbance."

Del Vecchio is headed back to the field this June to take final measurements on calves born in 2006, and to recover radio collars used in the study. Then, she and Arthur will take another look at the data and write their final report.

The study collected lots of data. So, when they're finished with the project report, Arthur, Del Vecchio and others will look at other ways to use that data. Arthur says the techniques to analyze GPS data have not kept up with the ability to gather it, so they may be developing new techniques. They hope to look more closely at where caribou move and what habitat they use in relation to oil field infrastructure.

Dave Yokel, wildlife biologist with the Bureau of Land Management, said he's looking forward to that sort of analysis. "We hope we can use the results to mitigate any impacts on the Teshepuk (caribou) herd from development in the NPRA (National Petroleum Reserve Alaska)," he said. To do that, the BLM needs to know more about the impacts on caribou of movement through infrastructure.

Looking back over his experiences in the field, Arthur says he is struck by the resilience of the calves. "The thing that impresses me is how these little calves are so helpless and weak and they're born in these really harsh conditions—and yet most of these little guys still make it."

[From the ANWR Information Brief]

DO THE CARIBOU REALLY CARE?

Are caribou affected by oil development on the North Slope? It would appear not, based on the growing population of herds that use land in the existing oil fields in northern Alaska. The population of the Central Arctic caribou herd, which migrates north each summer into the oil fields near Prudhoe Bay, has been growing about 8.5 percent per year. Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game biologists counted 31,857 caribou in aerial surveys of this herd in July 2002. In July 2000, fish and game biologists counted 27,128. In 1997, the count was 19,730.

Caribou herd populations rise and fall with natural cycles, but one explanation biologists have for the increasing population of the Central Arctic Herd is good calf production and survival, and high survival of adults.

Pregnant caribou cows in the Central Arctic herd bear their calves on lands within or near operating oil fields. Some calves are born within a few hundred meters of oil field roads.

The Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game findings are backed by the Argonne National Laboratory. Argonne found no evidence that oil development harmed the Central Arctic Herd in the lab's work on the Environmental Impact Statement for an extension of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System federal right-of-way.

ARCTIC CARIBOU HERDS

Caribou herds rise and fall in natural cycles, and it is interesting that while populations have been rising in the Central Arctic Herd (see chart) which use lands in the North Slope oilfields, populations have been declining in the Porcupine herd (see chart) which do not use lands where there is oil and gas development. The Central Arctic Herd increased to 32,000 animals in 2002, up from 27,000 in 2000. The Porcupine herd was estimated at 123,000 in 2001, 129,000 in 1998 and 152,000 in 1994. In 1989, the population was counted at 178,000. Most recent survey taken in 2002.

CENTRAL ARCTIC, PORCUPINE CARIBOU MINGLE

There is now evidence that caribou mix between all of the North Slope caribou herds, the Porcupine, Central Arctic and Western Arctic herds. Using analysis of DNA, researchers from the University of Alaska, Texas A&M University and the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture found that caribou in the three herds are genetically related. This reflects migration of animals between the herds over many generations.

THE TRUTH ON ARCTIC CARIBOU

Caribou use of the 1002 Area of ANWR varies dramatically from year to year. In 1995, 92% of the Porcupine Caribou Herd used this area to calve. In 2000 none did so.

In some years, the Porcupine Herd calves only in Canada.

Choice of calving area depends on snow melt and early growth of forage plants.

Caribou live a boom and bust cycle, due to predation, weather, and overhunting.

During the summer, caribou frequently use oil field roads and gravel pads as insect relief habitat: they stand on the elevated gravel pads because fewer mosquitoes and flies harass them there.

North slope oil facilities are specifically designed to allow caribou migration with elevated pipes to allow caribou to freely walk underneath and limited use of service roads.

With 30 years of contact with oil development to go by, the industry has shown that caribou and oil fields can successfully co-exist. The Central Arctic Herd, which calves in the vicinity of the Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk, and Milne Point oil fields, has increased 900% from an estimated 3,000 animals in the early 1970s to 32,000 in 2002.

ANWR FACTS:

Refuge totals 19.6 million acres.
8 million acres designated Wilderness;
Coastal Plain, 1.5 million acres, set aside by Congress for study of oil potential;
Only a small percentage of Coastal plain, about 2,000 acres, would be impacted by oil development;

THE COASTAL PLAIN IS NOT A PRISTINE WILDERNESS:

About 40 guide outfits offer hunting and recreation services in the coastal plain; A community, Kaktovik, exists in the Coastal Plain; Military installations operate on the Plain now and in the past.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, once again, we see the caribou herds that have been associated with oil and gas drilling actually expanding from 5,000 to 32,000.

Facts are hard to come by when they don't benefit you in the discussion. It is simply untrue what they have been trying to narrate in this respect.

This truly shows that you can work hand in hand, being environmentally friendly and having energy independence, empowering local communities and Tribes, looking at this in a comprehensive fashion.

This is a commonsense amendment. This is not about delay. This is about proper orientation, whether it be jobs associated with it or whether it be the numbers of critical habitat and numbers of populations within that critical habitat.

The facts just don't stand up for the other side.

Mr. Chair, once again, this is a very good amendment. Once again, when we want to start talking about facts, facts that are exploited by the other side that are truly false, we have to start looking at, didactically, the facts.

When a herd goes from 5,000 caribou to 32,000 when it is associated with oil and gas drilling in that area, where a herd declines by one third where there is no drilling there, there has got to be some kind of a prospect here.

Heat doesn't just rise. It is associated with the protection.

So, when you start looking at what industry and the individuals have done to promote these herds, this is a stellar amendment.

Mr. Chair, I hope that everybody votes for this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, well, again, this canard that oil and gas drilling is good for caribou is right out of the "thank you for smoking" playbook. It is just not true.

And rather than subscribe to these alternative facts, we need look no further than the latest credible science that we have—it is from the 2018 Arctic Report Card—which found that caribou populations across the Arctic have actually declined by 56 percent over the last two decades. Yet, there is one exception to that trend, and that is the Porcupine caribou herd, which has shown strength.

This is good news. It shows the importance of the National Wildlife Refuge system and the wisdom of protecting this area in the first place.

There is one place in the Arctic where caribou are thriving. It is a place where we haven't done oil and gas development.

Let's not wreck the coastal plain of the Arctic refuge. If we care about caribou, then, by all means, absolutely vote "no" on this amendment and vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part D of House Report 116-200 on

which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3, as modified, by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—193

Aderholt	Gallagher	Marshall
Allen	Gianforte	Massie
Amodei	Gibbs	Mast
Armstrong	Gohmert	McCarthy
Arrington	Gonzalez (OH)	McCaul
Babin	Gonzalez (TX)	McClintock
Bacon	Gonzalez-Colón	McHenry
Baird	(PR)	McKinley
Balderson	Gooden	Meadows
Banks	Gosar	Meuser
Barr	Granger	Miller
Bergman	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Green (TN)	Mullin
Bost	Griffith	Newhouse
Brady	Grothman	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Guest	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Olson
Buchanan	Hagedorn	Palazzo
Buck	Harris	Palmer
Bucshon	Hartzler	Pence
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Perry
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Burgess	Hice (GA)	Posey
Byrne	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Calvert	Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler
Carter (GA)	Holding	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Hollingsworth	Riggleman
Chabot	Hudson	Roby
Cheney	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Cline	Hunter	Roe, David P.
Cloud	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Conaway	Jordan	Roy
Cook	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Costa	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crawford	Katko	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Keller	Scott, Austin
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Simpson
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Dunn	LaHood	Spano
Emmer	LaMalfa	Stauber
Estes	Lamborn	Stefanik
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Steil
Fleischmann	Latta	Steube
Flores	Lesko	Stewart
Fortenberry	Long	Stivers
Fox (NC)	Loudermilk	Taylor
Fulcher	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry

Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

□ 1119

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. TED LIEU of California changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LONG changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) 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 CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—184

NOES—230

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
Lynch
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Rush
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta

Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Correa

Cummings
Duffy
Gabbard
Marchant
McEachin

Radewagen
Reed
Rice (NY)
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

NOES—237

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
Lynch
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)

Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Panetta
Pappas
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham
Beyer
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Correa

Cummings
Duffy
Gabbard
Huizenga
Marchant
McEachin

Radewagen
Rice (NY)
Turner
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1126

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY
MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment, as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

AYES—187

Aderholt	Gallagher	McClintock
Allen	Gianforte	McHenry
Amodei	Gibbs	McKinley
Armstrong	Gohmert	Meadows
Arrington	Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser
Babin	Gonzalez-Colón	Miller
Bacon	(PR)	Mitchell
Baird	Gooden	Moolenaar
Balderson	Gosar	Mooney (WV)
Banks	Granger	Mullin
Barr	Graves (GA)	Newhouse
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Norman
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Nunes
Bilirakis	Green (TN)	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Palazzo
Bost	Grothman	Palmer
Brady	Guest	Pence
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Perry
Brooks (IN)	Hagedorn	Peterson
Buchanan	Harris	Posey
Buck	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Bucshon	Hern, Kevin	Reed
Budd	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Burchett	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman
Byrne	Hill (AR)	Roby
Calvert	Holding	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Roe, David P.
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rose, John W.
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Scalise
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cook	Keller	Shinkus
Costa	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Curtis	King (NY)	Smucker
Davidson (OH)	Kinzinger	Spano
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Stauber
DesJarlais	LaHood	Steil
Duffy	LaMalfa	Steube
Duncan	Lamborn	Stewart
Dunn	Latta	Stivers
Emmer	Lesko	Taylor
Estes	Long	Thompson (PA)
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Fleischmann	Lucas	Timmons
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Fortenberry	Marshall	Turner
Fox (NC)	Massie	Upton
Fulcher	McCarthy	Wagner
Gaetz	McCauley	Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—237

Adams	Green, Al (TX)
Aguilar	Grijalva
Allred	Haaland
Amash	Hastings
Axne	Hayes
Barragán	Heck
Bass	Higgins (NY)
Beatty	Hill (CA)
Bera	Himes
Beyer	Horn, Kendra S.
Bishop (GA)	Horsford
Blumenauer	Houlahan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer
Bonamici	Huffman
Boyle, Brendan F.	Jackson Lee
Brindisi	Jayapal
Brown (MD)	Jeffries
Brownley (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Bustos	Johnson (TX)
Butterfield	Kaptur
Carbajal	Katko
Cárdenas	Keating
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Kennedy
Case	Khanna
Casten (IL)	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Kilmer
Chu, Judy	Kim
Cicilline	Kind
Cisneros	Kirkpatrick
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi
Clarke (NY)	Kuster (NH)
Clay	Lamb
Cleaver	Langevin
Cohen	Larsen (WA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)
Cooper	Lawrence
Courtney	Lawson (FL)
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)
Craig	Lee (NV)
Crist	Levin (CA)
Crow	Levin (MI)
Cuellar	Lewis
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted
Davids (KS)	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren
Dean	Lowey
DeFazio	Luján
DeGette	Luria
DeLauro	Lynch
DeBene	Malinowski
Delgado	Maloney,
Demings	Carolyn B.
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean
Deutch	Mast
Diaz-Balart	Matsui
Dingell	McAdams
Doggett	McBath
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum
Engel	McGovern
Escobar	McNerney
Eshoo	Meeks
Espallat	Meng
Evans	Moore
Finkenauer	Morelle
Fitzpatrick	Moulton
Fletcher	Mucarsel-Powell
Foster	Murphy
Frankel	Nadler
Fudge	Napolitano
Gallego	Neal
Garamendi	Neguse
Garcia (IL)	Norcross
Garcia (TX)	Norton
Golden	O'Halleran
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Gottheimer	Pallone
	Panetta

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Correa

Cummings
Gabbard
Harder (CA)
Huizenga
Marchant

Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

□ 1133

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 528.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, 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. 1146) to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 548, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Curtis moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1146, to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the date the President certifies that the enactment of this Act will not result in a net increase of Russian oil and gas imports into the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the famous line from Thomas Jefferson, "The government closest to the people serves the people best." So how is it that we are here today considering a bill that has been opposed by every member of the Alaskan delegation since 1980? Not just the Alaskan delegation, but every Governor of Alaska since 1980 and even the gubernatorial candidates last year, two Republicans, an independent, and a Democrat, opposed this bill.

This week, many of my friends across the aisle sought to protect their coastlines by banning offshore energy development. They know what is best in their States. Apparently, the same standard of local control does not apply to Mr. YOUNG, who is the only person in this body elected by the residents of Alaska.

Not only is this bill opposed by the entire Alaskan delegation, it is opposed by the local Alaska Native population and written without their consultation.

As a Member who represents Bears Ears, I hear from my colleagues all the time how important it is to have Native American consultation, and they are right. However, with local Alaska Native opposition to this bill and no consultation, there seems to be a double standard.

In fact, just 3 days ago, I sat in a hearing where BLM was criticized for not working with the Native population. They held 11 hearings, 7 listening sessions—apparently, not enough.

Unless I missed 18 trips of my colleagues to Alaska, we are working with a double standard.

Those of you from States with very little Federal ownership have a difficult time understanding what it is like being from a State or county with 90 percent Federal ownership. Imagine being a local elected official maintaining roads, police, fire, sewers, and parks when only 10 percent of your property generates property tax.

At the end of the day, Mr. YOUNG and the native Alaskans, not the rest of us, should be determining the fate of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the argument that this development will contribute to climate change. Really? I am listening. This is one Republican who believes the climate is changing and man is influencing it, but I am baffled why so many of my colleagues will give a pass to a human rights-violating dictator in China and deny the local native Alaskans the right to have a living off the land.

If we were serious about climate change, I have an idea. Let's take all the natural gas we are putting back into the ground in ANWR and send it to China and India. We would do more to reduce global carbon emissions than by implementing the entire Green New Deal.

I have heard the term "science denier" tossed around, but I ask, who is denying science the most? Those who ignore 85 percent of carbon coming from outside the United States, or those who think that impacting 0.01 percent of ANWR will destroy the Alaskan environment?

Let's put this in perspective. ANWR is less than 5 percent of Alaska. This project is less than 0.01 percent of ANWR. For perspective, that is like taking a janitorial closet in the Capitol of 175 feet and putting HVAC in it to keep us warm and cool. That is the perspective.

When the other side is ready to fight climate change, Republicans stand ready. This is not one of those times.

To start, my friend GREG WALDEN and his colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee seem to have the ability to generate a bill almost daily that would truly impact the true problems with climate change.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit will prevent the bill from taking effect until the President certifies that it will not result in a net increase of Russian oil and gas imports into the United States.

The answer to climate change is not making the U.S. more reliant on foreign fossil fuels. A vote for this MTR is a vote to support local Alaska Natives.

I repeat, the answer to climate change is not making the U.S. more reliant on foreign fossil fuels. The last time I checked, Ryan Zinke was the only one riding a horse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for those who have flights to catch and would like to get out of here, I think I have some good news. I think we can keep this pretty short and pretty simple because this is a very simple bill. It reflects the proposition that there are some places that are simply too special, that are too unique, that are too environmentally vital, and that are too sacred to indigenous people to wreck them with oil and gas development. Surely, that is something that most Americans and even most people in this body, regardless of their party, could agree upon.

In fact, we saw bipartisan votes yesterday that reflected the same proposition that the pristine coasts of the Atlantic, the Lowcountry in South Carolina, and the beautiful California coast are places too special to wreck them with new oil and gas development. If my colleagues believe in this simple proposition, then, surely, it must apply to America's largest wildlife refuge and to the beating biological heart of that refuge, the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is the simple thing that this bill is all about.

Unfortunately, this motion to recommit is an attempt to distract us from that, to delay protections against this drilling, so that this administration can rush a lease plan forward. Frankly, by that time, it is too late. You can't go backward once you open a place like this up to drilling.

Now, my friends' concern for the local voices, some of whom in Alaska want to see drilling, would be a lot more persuasive if, yesterday, we hadn't had a vote where my friends across the aisle thumbed their nose at the local voices in California, South

Carolina, Florida, and other places that don't want offshore drilling. So let's be consistent about what local voices matter, and let's acknowledge the reality that the only voice they really are hearing is that of Big Oil.

The truth is that this bill will not affect or impact our role in global energy markets in the slightest. The minority seems to believe that we can provide enough oil, if we just drill everywhere, to let everyone in the world break free of Russian gas or Saudi Arabian oil.

The truth is that we are, right now, the largest oil producer in the world. We produce over 12 million barrels of crude oil every single day, and we are not going to be able to corner the market. I certainly don't think, in light of that fact, that we should put at risk America's coastal jobs or our biggest wildlife refuge in the Arctic under this misguided notion of so-called energy dominance.

Now, I want to just close with two things. First, for those who may still have some fiscal sensibility, I think there are still a few in this House who would like to talk about fiscal issues. Last week, Taxpayers for Common Sense said in an op-ed: "Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will be difficult and costs from mistakes high. Right now, oil and gas is plentiful and prices are low, so this isn't the time to develop marginal areas. It's not like the oil is going away. So without huge returns, this action will put taxpayers on the hook for a lot of risk with little potential reward. In the current fiscal and energy climate, if drilling proposals in the Arctic Refuge move forward, the joke's on us."

Let the joke not be on us, colleagues.

Finally, I want to close by pointing out that there are some people who have traveled thousands of miles to be with us today, all the way from Alaska, the Gwich'in people, an indigenous community that since time immemorial have depended on the Porcupine caribou herd and its migratory route and its calving grounds that are absolutely in the heart of the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. Many of them are here today.

And, ladies and gentlemen, none of us here on this floor have to worry about what our ancestors and what our family depend on for our way of life, for our culture, for what is sacred for them, depending on the outcome of this vote. For Gwich'in people, that is exactly what is at stake.

So, colleagues, let's do the right thing for the environment. Let's recognize that some places are too special to wreck with oil and gas drilling. Let's do right by the Gwich'in people. Vote "no" on this motion to recommit and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 189, nays 229, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—189

Aderholt	Gooden	Nunes
Allen	Gosar	Olson
Amodel	Granger	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Green (TN)	Posey
Baird	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Grothman	Reed
Banks	Guest	Reschenthaler
Barr	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Biggs	Harris	Roby
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Buchanan	Holding	Roy
Buck	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Bucshon	Hudson	Scalise
Budd	Hunter	Schweikert
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cheney	Katko	Spano
Cline	Keller	Staubert
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Steube
Comer	King (NY)	Stewart
Conaway	Kinzinger	Stivers
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Crawford	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Curtis	Lamborn	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Latta	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Lesko	Turner
DesJarlais	Long	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Wagner
Duffy	Lucas	Walberg
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	Mast	Waltz
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Flores	McKinley	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Meadows	Westerman
Fox (NC)	Meuser	Williams
Fulcher	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gibbs	Mullin	Wright
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Zeldin

NAYS—229

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Case
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Casten (IL)
Amash	F.	Castor (FL)
Axne	Brindisi	Chu, Judy
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Cicilline
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cisneros
Beatty	Bustos	Clark (MA)
Bera	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Beyer	Carbajal	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Cohen

Connolly	Kennedy	Pressley
Cooper	Khanma	Price (NC)
Costa	Kildee	Quigley
Courtney	Kilmer	Raskin
Cox (CA)	Kim	Richmond
Craig	Kind	Rooney (FL)
Crist	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda
Cuellar	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Cunningham	Lamb	Ruiz
Daids (KS)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis, Danny K.	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Dean	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Levin (CA)	Schiff
Delgado	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Demings	Lewis	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schrier
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Doggett	Lofgren	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lowe	Shalala
Engel	Luján	Sherman
Escobar	Luria	Sherrill
Eshoo	Lynch	Sires
Espallat	Malinowski	Slotkin
Evans	Maloney	Smith (NJ)
Finkenauer	Carolyn B.	Smith (WA)
Guest	Maloney, Sean	Soto
Fletcher	Matsui	Spanberger
Foster	McAdams	Speier
Frankel	McBath	Stanton
Fudge	McCollum	Stevens
Gallego	McGovern	Suozzi
Garamendi	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Garcia (IL)	Meeks	Takano
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Golden	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Gomez	Morelle	Titus
Gottheimer	Moulton	Tlaib
Green, Al (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Tonko
Grijalva	Murphy	Torres (CA)
Haaland	Nadler	Torres Small
Harder (CA)	Napolitano	(NM)
Hastings	Neal	Trahan
Hayes	Neguse	Trone
Hick	Norcross	Underwood
Higgins (NY)	O'Halloran	Van Drew
Hill (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Himes	Omar	Veasey
Horn, Kendra S.	Pallone	Vela
Horsford	Panetta	Velázquez
Houlahan	Pappas	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pascarell	Wasserman
Huffman	Payne	Schultz
Jackson Lee	Perlmuter	Waters
Jayapal	Peters	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Peterson	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Phillips	Wexton
Johnson (TX)	Pingree	Wild
Kaptur	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Porter	Yarmuth
Kelly (IL)		

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Cummings	McCauley
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	McEachin
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Rice (NY)
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	Yoho
Correa	Marchant	

□ 1154

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 529.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 225, noes 193, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—225

Adams	Grijalva	Panetta
Aguilar	Haaland	Pappas
Allred	Harder (CA)	Pascarell
Amash	Hastings	Payne
Axne	Hayes	Perlmuter
Barragán	Heck	Peters
Bass	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Beatty	Bera	Pingree
Beyer	Himes	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Blumenauer	Horsford	Pressley
Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Hoyer	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Raskin
F.	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Brindisi	Jayapal	Rooney (FL)
Brown (MD)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Bustos	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carbajal	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Ryan
Cartwright	Khanna	Sánchez
Case	Kildee	Sarbanes
Casten (IL)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kim	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Kind	Schiff
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cisneros	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Clarke (NY)	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Clay	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Lawrence	Shalala
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sires
Craig	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Crist	Levin (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Crow	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Stanton
Dean	Lowenthal	Stefanik
DeFazio	Lowe	Stevens
DeGette	Luján	Suozzi
DeLauro	Luria	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Takano
Delgado	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Maloney	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Titus
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
Dingell	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McAdams	Torres (CA)
Doyle, Michael	McBath	Torres Small
F.	McCollum	(NM)
Engel	McGovern	Trahan
Escobar	McNerney	Trone
Eshoo	Meeks	Underwood
Espallat	Meng	Van Drew
Evans	Moore	Vargas
Finkenauer	Morelle	Veasey
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Velázquez
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Visclosky
Frankel	Murphy	Wasserman
Fudge	Nadler	Schultz
Gallego	Napolitano	Waters
Garamendi	Neal	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Welch
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Wexton
Golden	O'Halloran	Wild
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Wilson (FL)
Gottheimer	Omar	Yarmuth
Green, Al (TX)	Pallone	

NOES—193

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Calvert
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Amash	Bost	Carter (TX)
Amodel	Brady	Chabot
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cheney
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cline
Babin	Buchanan	Cloud
Bacon	Buck	Cole
Balderson	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Banks	Budd	Comer
Barr	Burchett	Conaway
Bergman	Burgess	Cook
Biggs	Byrne	Costa

Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
Crenshaw	Jordan	Roe, David P.
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Davidson (OH)	Katko	Rose, John W.
Davis, Rodney	Keller	Rouzer
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Duffy	King (IA)	Scalise
Duncan	King (NY)	Schweikert
Dunn	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Estes	LaHood	Shimkus
Ferguson	LaMalfa	Simpson
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Fletcher	Latta	Smith (NE)
Flores	Lesko	Smucker
Fortenberry	Long	Spano
Fox (NC)	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fulcher	Lucas	Steil
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Steube
Gallagher	Marshall	Stewart
Gianforte	Massie	Stivers
Gibbs	Mast	Taylor
Gohmert	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gonzalez (OH)	McCaul	Thornberry
Gooden	McClintock	Timmons
Gosar	McHenry	Tipton
Granger	McKinley	Turner
Graves (GA)	Meadows	Upton
Graves (LA)	Meuser	Vela
Graves (MO)	Miller	Wagner
Green (TN)	Mitchell	Walberg
Griffith	Moolenaar	Walden
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Guest	Mullin	Walorski
Guthrie	Newhouse	Waltz
Hagedorn	Norman	Watkins
Harris	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hartzer	Olson	Webster (FL)
Hern, Kevin	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Westerman
Hice (GA)	Pence	Williams
Higgins (LA)	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Hill (AR)	Peterson	Wittman
Holding	Posey	Womack
Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Hudson	Reed	Wright
Hunter	Reschenthaler	Young
Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Riggleman	
Johnson (OH)	Roby	

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Correa	Marchant
Baird	Cummings	McEachin
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Yoho
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	

□ 1202

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, at the end of a long vote series today, I unintentionally voted nay for H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plan Protection Act, on rollcall number 530. Had I been able to correct my vote at that time, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from votes on Thursday September 12, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 526; "nay" on rollcall No. 527; "nay" on rollcall No. 528; "nay" on rollcall No. 529; and "yea" on rollcall No. 530.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO PROVIDE AUDIO BACKUP FILE OF DEPOSITION OF ROGER J. STONE JR.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 553) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide a copy of

the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of the transcribed interview of Roger J. Stone Jr. conducted by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on September 26, 2017, to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of the United States of America v. Stone, No. 1:19-cr-00018-ABJ (D.D.C.), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 553

Whereas on September 26, 2017, Roger J. Stone Jr. appeared in Washington, DC, and was interviewed by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives in connection with that Committee's investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 United States election;

Whereas the Department of Justice requested in a December 14, 2018, letter to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that the Committee provide a transcript of its September 26, 2017, interview with Mr. Stone, as well as any other written submissions or correspondence from Mr. Stone or his attorneys before and after his interview;

Whereas on December 20, 2018, pursuant to a bipartisan Committee vote on that date authorizing the release of Executive Session materials, the then-Chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence jointly sent the Department of Justice the transcript of Mr. Stone's September 26, 2017, interview, as well as an enumerated list of related materials;

Whereas on January 24, 2019, Mr. Stone was indicted by a grand jury on seven counts, including one count of obstruction of an official proceeding, in violation of sections 1505 and 2 of title 18, United States Code, and five counts of making false statements in violation of sections 1001(a)(2) and 2 of title 18, United States Code;

Whereas the Department of Justice requested via letter on August 20, 2019, that the House voluntarily provide to it a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of Mr. Stone's September 26, 2017, transcribed interview;

Whereas by the privileges and rights of the House of Representatives, an audio backup file of Mr. Stone's transcribed interview may not be taken from the possession or control of the Clerk of the House of Representatives by mandate of process of the article III courts of the United States, and may not be provided pursuant to requests by the court or the parties to *United States of America v. Stone* except at the direction of the House; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the House of Representatives that, in the particular circumstances of this case, providing a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of Mr. Stone's transcribed interview to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of *United States v. Stone* would promote the ends of justice in a manner consistent with the privileges and rights of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives directs the Clerk of the House to provide for use at trial a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of the transcribed interview of Roger J. Stone Jr. that was conducted by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House

of Representatives on September 26, 2017, to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of *United States of America v. Stone*, No. 1:19-cr-00018-ABJ (D.D.C.).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate, and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday of next week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, and last votes are expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House, Mr. Speaker, will consider a clean continuing resolution to fund the government past September 30. While the House did its work, and sent 10 appropriation bills to the Senate, funding 96 percent of the government—the first time that is been done in over three decades—I am disappointed that the Senate failed to pass a single appropriation bill. Not one.

Not only that, they haven't filed any until just the other day when we got back from the summer break.

I am disappointed that the Senate failed to introduce a single appropriation bill for the first time in more than three decades. So that while we were very successful, the Senate failed to move forward.

Therefore, as we wait for them to complete their work so that we can begin conference negotiations, a continuing resolution will be necessary to prevent another government shutdown like the one we experienced earlier this year.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1423, Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act, called the FAIR Act, and the legislation would eliminate forced arbitration in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases so that Americans, as they have under the Constitution, would have the right to seek redress of grievances through the courts.