

This legislation would expand the withdrawal area and also expand the mineral withdrawal in the withdrawal area to include oil and gas leasing, geothermal leasing, and other mineral development in addition to mining.

Mr. Chairman, there are rare earths and other valuable minerals, including copper and uranium, in this area. There is also a great amount of geothermal potential. We should at least know all the minerals and resources potential in this million-acre area before we permanently lock it up. This just requires mapping and surveying of the targeted areas for the withdrawal.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

□ 1430

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow Secretary Bernhardt to kill this proposal in pursuit of information we already have.

My colleagues across the aisle continually allude to the lack of information we have about this region, the lack of study, and the lack of science. They seem to ignore the extensive, multiyear study that preceded the current withdrawal.

That study looked at local economies. It reviewed the best available science. It took into account public comments. It considered how uranium mining might impact the Grand Canyon region.

In the end, the review produced a 1,500-page environmental impact report outlining, in detail, the rationales for different actions. Within the report, there was a detailed analysis considering other mineral resources in the region, the very study the gentleman is now trying to predicate the withdrawal on.

The study did, indeed, find there were a handful of other mineral resources in the region, but the study also made clear that these elements were secondary to uranium and that they occurred in quantities insufficient to drive mine development. This is why, when you look at mineral claims in the withdrawal area, they are almost all for uranium.

We know uranium is the primary resource here, and we know the major threat that uranium poses to clean water, to public health, and to the Grand Canyon itself.

Uranium mines have polluted ground water and destroyed many communities across the Southwest. The landscape is littered with abandoned mine sites.

We only need to consider Kanab Creek Uranium Mine. It sits on the edge of the Grand Canyon and has been offline for years, yet virtually no remediation has been done. You can see the

site is still covered in waste rock, uranium ore tailings, and pond sludge. This toxic waste is exposed to the environment, escaping beyond the mine, infiltrating the soil, and elevating local uranium levels.

This mine is only one of hundreds of closed mines awaiting remediation. Industry likes to pretend like practices have changed, but they provide no assurances that they will do anything but despoil the land and leave taxpayers with the bill.

Despite protests from the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), we know what the resources are, and we know what the threats are to this region.

We don't need to duplicate a study to tell us that we shouldn't be mining in the Grand Canyon, and we certainly should not let misinformed talking points kill this bill.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this is a typical breccia pipe, and you are seeing the collapsing of the geological formations. What is so interesting about that is that it concentrates different minerals there, not just uranium. Copper, vanadium, there are a number of things here that have all of a sudden become very critical in our technology sector.

This is a very important application here, and we want to make sure that we are studying that properly.

Now, if we are talking about the reclamation process, well, here we go. Yes, 80 years ago, we didn't reclaim mines right. We didn't ask them to be bonded. We didn't go back and investigate them for mitigation.

This is what American mining actually does. It takes what they need; it returns it. And I would be very interested in taking a Geiger counter to check this versus this when it started. I wonder if there is an improvement.

Deja vu? It is. So, once again, the arguments are bland. They are fraudulent. In this aspect, we show mitigation.

What we can do when we have a mine site like this is we can actually leverage them and say: Listen, in order to do this, we need you to mitigate some of these other mining sites.

It has been something that our side has proposed nonstop, but the other side refuses to let that happen because, they claim, that it is not going to be up to standard. That tells you people are scared of their own laws.

This looks pretty good to me. When I look at the mitigation aspects and what is here and available, that is for the common cause for the American people. It is an investiture. You are not doing your due diligence unless you know exactly what you have for today and the future.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is smart. It is critical and, from that standpoint, empowering. I ask everybody to vote "yes" on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, and in opposition to the amendment, in July, the President formed a nuclear working group, the Nuclear Fuel Working Group, essentially to deal with the questions coming from the uranium mining industry, in particular, Energy Fuels and Ur-Energy.

The issue there was an attempt to try to defend the indefensible in trying to open up the Grand Canyon once more, looking at lifting the moratorium. So the urgency for the legislation before us is based on acts that the administration has taken at this point.

One should note that Secretary Bernhardt represented Ur-Energy USA from 2009 to 2012.

My point is that enough advocates exist for the mining industry as we stand.

What we are asking, in defeat of this amendment, is that the public interest has some advocates, and that Members of this body can take care of that public interest and not the profit interests that seem to be driving any decisions around mining and particularly uranium mining.

The public interest is the public health, the Grand Canyon, the water supply for 40 million people, and the Tribes and indigenous people and communities that exist there that have been for decade upon decade coming to this Congress, coming to their leadership, asking for support and relief. This bill begins to provide both.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TONKO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, 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. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CHACO CULTURAL HERITAGE AREA PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2181.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 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. 2181.

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

□ 1439

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. 2181) to provide for the withdrawal and protection of certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, with Mr. CUELLAR 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 3 of House Resolution 656 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Mr. Chair, Du hino-meh. Idza dyu-qe-dza. Svwimi Hanu. My name is DEBRA HAALAND. I am from the Turquoise Clan and an enrolled member of the Laguna Pueblo.

I wish to acknowledge that we are on Indian land, and I humbly ask to speak on this important bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

First, Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleagues, Assistant Speaker BEN RAY LUJÁN, Senator TOM UDALL, and Senator MARTIN HEINRICH for their years of hard work on this important legislation.

This proposal, sponsored by my good friend and fellow New Mexico Representative, Mr. LUJÁN, would protect the cultural resources at Chaco Culture National Historical Park, as well as New Mexico's clean air, from the impact of oil and gas extraction.

This bill would withdraw land in a 10-mile buffer zone around Chaco Culture National Historical Park to protect that site and the region's undiscovered resources from the impacts of further oil and gas extraction.

Chaco Canyon and the greater Chaco region have been home to my people

for centuries. As a 35th generation New Mexican and a descendant of the indigenous inhabitants of what is now the Southwest United States, I can say that there are few places more exceptional than the Chaco region. Over hundreds of years, my ancestors engineered and constructed massive multi-story structures at Chaco Canyon that became the ceremonial, administrative, and economic center of the region.

It is a certified International Dark Sky Park, where visitors can gaze at the same dark sky with myriad stars that my ancestors did over 1,000 years ago.

These sites and the objects they contain tell the history of my people and connect us to our past.

The Indian Pueblos and the Navajo Nation still have intimate connections with the greater Chaco region, recognizing the area as a spiritual place to be honored and respected.

This Congress, the Natural Resources Committee has heard from the leaders of four Pueblo nations, the All Pueblo Council of Governors, elected leaders of the Navajo Nation, the National Congress of American Indians, senior officials in Tribal and Pueblo governments, and a plethora of Americans, all of whom support H.R. 2181.

The entire New Mexico Congressional Delegation and the Governor of our State support H.R. 2181.

This bill enjoys broad support on the ground and bipartisan support here in this Chamber because protecting indigenous cultural resources, protecting Chaco Canyon, should not be a partisan issue.

This proposal is about respecting our history and protecting our culture. We owe it to Tribal communities, to the people of New Mexico, and to people the world over to permanently protect the Chaco region.

Earlier this year, I traveled to the Chaco Culture National Historical Park with several of my colleagues. While in New Mexico, we had the opportunity to use infrared cameras to watch plumes of methane and pollution spewing from oil and gas operations, creating a toxic cloud the size of Delaware that hangs over the skies of northwestern New Mexico.

Ninety percent of the Federal lands in this region are already open to oil and gas extraction, and New Mexicans are all too familiar with the toxic impacts it has on clean air, clean water, their health, and the health of their children.

□ 1445

When you are out there watching the methane plumes and experiencing the dust, the noise, the light pollution and their impacts, it is easy to see why oil and gas extraction does not belong next to a sacred ancestral site of the Pueblo people.

If you don't believe me, you can ask Interior Secretary Bernhardt. When he visited Chaco Canyon earlier this year

with Senator MARTIN HEINRICH, he definitely was struck by the significance of the park because he committed to a 1-year moratorium on drilling around Chaco Canyon to allow Congress to act on proposals like the one before us today.

I thank the Secretary for his efforts, but 1 year is not enough protection for a site that holds centuries of history and culture. That is why I ask you all to support Chaco Canyon today, to support the Pueblo people, the Navajo Nation, and the people of New Mexico by voting in favor of H.R. 2181.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2181. Mr. Chairman, this is yet another piece of legislation advanced by my colleagues on behalf of the radical environmental movement. This bill will unilaterally lock up oil and gas development on 316,000 acres of federally owned land in New Mexico.

The Department of the Interior is in the process of drafting a resource management plan for this area, but this process is still under review and the resource management plan has not yet been released. This bill would permanently ban all energy development in the area before we know all the facts and before a science-based environmental review is completed.

Decisions made in Washington regarding how to manage federally owned land have implications beyond the borders of the acreage in question. Those who own land or operate businesses near federally owned parcels are oftentimes significantly impacted by poor management decisions made by the Federal bureaucrats who do not live there or understand the needs of the rural Western communities.

Similarly, my colleagues claim that this bill will do no harm to those who own lands and mineral rights in the surrounding area, but this bill could mean millions in lost revenue for those who own lands along the proposed withdrawal boundary.

While it is technically true that the acreage off limits to development under this bill is federally owned, there are lands located throughout the withdrawal area that are privately owned by the members of the Navajo Nation.

If you take a look at this map, anything you see in this purple area—particularly in this area is what we are talking about—is owned by the Navajo allottees. So when you are looking at the expansion of this park, it impugns access to that area.

Now, as you see, the Navajo-owned lands and minerals are scattered throughout and are located outside the withdrawal area. But if these lands are unavailable for development, they become restricted and further cut off from access points and from development opportunities. If the neighboring land can never be developed, as required under this bill, the economic

value of these private minerals is diminished and the Navajo owners will have a harder time attracting investments on their land.

Once again, you see the skirting all the way through this area, particularly in this band alongside there, so access is critical.

We heard testimony to this fact in the Natural Resources Committee this summer. Ms. Delora Hesuse testified in opposition to this bill, stating: "Our voices as allotted landowners are being silenced by environmentalists claiming to speak for all of us. These lands were given to our great-grandparents in exchange for citizenship, and we have rights as citizens and landowners to develop our lands for oil and gas as we see fit."

She continued: "If BLM lands are withdrawn around our allotments, that means oil and gas companies cannot access our lands, because they won't be able to access the Federal lands."

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD her testimony.

DELORA HESUSE, NAVAJO INDIAN ALLOTTEE,
NAGEEZI CHAPTER

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC
LANDS

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 2181 CHACO CULTURAL
HERITAGE AREA PROTECTION ACT—
JUNE 5, 2019

Chairwoman Haaland, Ranking Member Young and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to bring voice to those Navajo tribal members who are being forgotten with this bill—Indian allottees.

I am Delora Hesuse, a citizen of the Navajo Nation, Nageezi Chapter. My chapter is in the Greater Chaco region and near the Chaco Culture National Historic Park. My grandmother was a Councilwoman for the Nageezi Chapter for eight years, and my father was a Navajo Nation Council Delegate for the Nageezi Chapter for twenty years.

Many people don't understand our Native American heritage and the fact that many individual Navajo Nation members such as I own private lands and the minerals underneath them. This is a steadfast personal property right that sustains our livelihoods and way of life. H.R. 2181 would put many of our mineral rights off limits and stop a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, clothe and protect our families. I'm not exaggerating the importance of this income. In 2015, the Federal Indian Minerals Office distributed \$96 million to 20,835 allottees. That's a significant source of income in an area that continues to struggle with unemployment.

My ancestors were allotted the land and mineral rights by the United States government many generations ago, and it pains me to see that my own leaders, both tribal and in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, are supporting a bill that would put my oil and natural gas rights off limits and/or seriously prevent my family from receiving income from the valuable energy resources that we own.

I am not alone. Many other Indian allottees in the Greater Chaco region agree with me. In fact, I have here a petition signed by 131 of us allottees opposing this buffer zone bill.

I also have with me another petition signed by many allottees that states that

the environmentalists' voice is not our voice. Our voices as Allotted landowners are being silenced by environmentalists claiming to speak for all of us. These lands were given to our great, great grandparents in exchange for citizenship, and we have rights as citizens and landowners to develop our lands for oil and gas as we see fit.

I also have two resolutions from the Huerfano and Nageezi chapters signed by our chapter presidents supporting us Navajo Allotment landowners and recognizing our opposition to this bill. These chapter resolutions call for a meeting with Senators Udall and Heinrich so that we can express our concerns with the bill and how it will limit our rights.

I am disappointed that the Department of the Interior, which is supposed to manage our mineral rights in trust to the benefit of my family and all other allottees, has stopped leasing for a full year. This action delays income to us allottees in the short term, but more importantly, sends a strong signal to oil and gas companies that generate the income on our behalf that investment in the area is risky and uncertain in the long term.

I have been participating actively in the Resource Management Planning (RMP) process which is under pressure from environmental groups and others opposed to responsible oil and natural gas development in the area. I continue to feel that the Interior Department and members of Congress are ignoring the voice of Indian allottees and listening only to environmental groups like Diné Care and other outside groups that want to keep oil and natural gas from being developed at all.

Besides not being realistic, it would deprive my family of income to sustain our way of life. Our voices should and must be heard equally along with the environmental special interest groups. In fact, with the Interior Department's trust responsibility, our voices should carry much more weight than that of outside special interests, but that is not the case with this bill.

The bill would put off limits my mineral rights and the mineral rights of thousands of allottees. While the bill claims not to affect my mineral rights, in fact, many allottee lands are surrounded by federal lands that would be withdrawn by this bill. If BLM lands are withdrawn around our allotments, that means oil and gas companies cannot access our lands, because they won't be able to access the federal lands.

Furthermore, since the oil and gas is accessed using horizontal drilling, putting the federal lands and minerals off limits will mean my minerals are also off limits. Because of the checkerboard pattern of lands, where allottee lands are often surrounded by BLM lands, particularly in the northeast segment of the buffer, if companies cannot access all minerals along the lateral of a horizontal well, they will not access any.

Companies will simply be discouraged from developing the minerals on my behalf because it just doesn't make sense economically or technologically to pinpoint my small amount of minerals stranded amongst federal minerals. What may be small to them, however, is not small to me. Companies will be discouraged from developing in all areas of the buffer at all, even on allottee lands.

I too care deeply about the Chaco cultural heritage. After all, I'm a Navajo who lives right in the Greater Chaco region. But the Chaco Culture National Historic Park already protects the Great Houses. Artifacts that may be outside the park are protected through the National Historic Preservation Act. Any development of my minerals and the minerals of other allottees is done in

strict accordance with the act, to make sure they are protected. Not only do we insist upon it, but that is the law of the land.

I urge the committee not to pass this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Mr. GOSAR. Further, two chapters of the Navajo Nation representing a combined 6,000 residents passed resolutions opposing this bill because it would jeopardize development and potentially "infringe on their royalty payments."

Mr. Chairman, I also include those in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION OF HUEFANO CHAPTER

RESOLUTION # HUE-090-18

Supporting the Navajo Allotment Owners in Opposition of "The Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018" and Furthermore Requesting U.S. Senators Tom Udall and Martin Heinrich to meet with Navajo Allotment Owners in Northwest New Mexico to Explain the Proposed Senate Bill 2907.

Whereas:

1. Huerfano Chapter is a certified governmental entity of the Navajo Nation charged with the responsibility to solicit, promote, and protect the interest and the welfare of the chapter and its community pursuant to the Navajo Nation Resolution CJ20-55, December 02, 1995 and Resolution CAP 34-98, adopting the Local Governance Act (LGA); and

2. Huerfano Chapter has a population of 3000 plus residents, both registered voters and nonregistered community members. The chapter is one of the largest land based chapters comprised of 553,528 acres in Eastern Agency, Navajo Nation and has nine (09) sub-communities including Adobe, Blanco, Bisti, Carson, Gallegos, Jacquez, Hogback, Huerfano, and Otis; and

3. The Navajo Allotment owners met on Jun 12, 2018 at Nageezi Chapter where over eighty-five (85) attended to voice their opinions on the proposed "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act" or Senate Bill 2907; and

4. Navajo Allotment Land Owners expressed their concerns that the "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018" might infringe on their royalty payments they are presently benefitting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands. The Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefit for their daily lives; and

5. Navajo Allotment owners are concerned that self-serving special interest organizations are violating the rights of Navajo Allotment Land Owners, that such publicized demonstrations and meetings by these special interest and outside groups have over shadowed the Navajo allotment land owners who benefits from oil and development on their allotment lands; and

6. Navajo Allotment Land Owners do not share opinions of environmentalists voicing their objectives on natural resources developments. These are over publicized objectives by the environmentalists have drowned out and overshadowed Navajo Allotment Land Owners Rights; and

7. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are truly the impacted people of the Chaco area. These lands were patented and allotted to the Navajo People in New Mexico and handed down through many generations. These lands were given in exchange for land taken by the U.S. Government in exchange for citizenships. Therefore, as Navajo People being land owners, they have the right to lease, develop, or excavate their lands; Now therefore be it

Resolved That: 1. The Huerfano Chapter hereby supports and recognizes the opposition by the Navajo Allotment Land Owners of the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” or Senate Bill 2904.

2. Huerfano Chapter hereby further supports and requests U.S. Senator Tom Udall and U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich to attend a meeting with Navajo Allotment Land Owners of the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” to explain the content and reasons of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018”. The meeting will allow Navajo Allotment Land Owners to express their concerns of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and how it will limit their rights.

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly presented and discussed at a duly called meeting of Huerfano Chapter, Navajo Nation (New Mexico), at which a quorum was present, and that the same was passed by a vote of 12 in favor, 00 opposed, and 08 abstained this 08th day of July 2018.

Motion by: Larry J. Bonney.

Second by: Cecil Werito Jr.

BEN WOODY JR.,
Chapter President.

IRENE L. HARVEY,
Chapter Vice-President.
LOIS Y. WERITO,
Secretary/Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF NAGEEZI CHAPTER—EASTERN AGENCY, DISTRICT 19

RESOLUTION # NC-18-077

Supporting the Navajo Allotment Owners in Opposition of The “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and Furthermore Requesting U.S. Senators Tom Udall and Martin Heinrich to meet with Navajo Allotment Owners in Northwest New Mexico to Explain the Proposed Senate Bill 2907

Whereas:

1. Pursuant to 26 N.N.C. §1(B), the Nageezi Chapter is delegated the governmental authority to make decisions over local matters consistent with Navajo Law, Custom, and Tradition and under 11 N.N.C., Part 1, Section 10, is delegated authority to make local decisions in the best interest and welfare of the community members; and

2. Nageezi Chapter with the population of 2500 to 3000 residents, registered and nonregistered voters, is made of up of nine (09) subcommunities including and not limited to: Nageezi, Lybrook, Twin Pines, Blanco, Kimbeto, Chaco Canyon, Escavada, Betoni Wash, Kinnadiz, and Dzilth-na-o-dith-hle, being one of the largest land base chapters in the Eastern Agency of the Navajo Nation; and

3. Navajo Allotment Land Owners met on June 12, 2018 at Nageezi Chapter where over eighty-five (85) attended to voice their opinions on the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018 or Senate Bill 2907; and

4. Navajo Allotment Land Owners expressed their concerns that the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” might infringe on their royalty payments they are presently benefitting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands. Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefits to their daily lives; and

5. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are concerned that self-serving special interest organizations are violating the rights of Nav-

ajo Allotment Land Owners. That such publicized demonstrations and meetings by these special interest and outside groups have over shadowed the Navajo Allotment Land Owners whom currently benefitting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands; and

6. Navajo Allotment Land Owners do not share opinions of environmentalists voicing their objections on natural resources developments. These over publicized objections by the environmentalists have drowned out and overshadowed Navajo Allotment Land Owners Rights; and

7. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are truly the impacted people of the Chaco area. These lands were patented and allotted to the Navajo People in New Mexico and handed down through many generations. These lands were given in exchange for land taken by the U.S. Government in exchange for citizenships. Therefore, as Navajo People being land owners, they have the right to lease, develop, or excavate their lands; Now therefore be it

Resolved That: 1. Nageezi Chapter hereby supports and recognizes the opposition by the Navajo Allotment Land Owners of the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” or Senate bill 2907; and

2. Nageezi Chapter hereby further supports and requests U.S. Senator Udall and U.S. Senator Heinrich to attend a meeting with Navajo Allotment Land Owners on the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” to explain the content and reasons of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018”. The meeting will allow Navajo Allotment Land Owners to express their concerns of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and how it will limit their rights.

CERTIFICATION

We Hereby Certify that the Foregoing Resolution #NC-18-077 was duly presented and discussed at a duly called meeting of Nageezi Chapter, Navajo Nation (New Mexico), at which a quorum was present, motioned by Delora Hesuse, seconded by Leon Sam, was voted on with 52 in favor, 00 opposed, and 03 abstained, this 01st day of July 2018.

ERVIN CHAVEZ,
Chapter President.
JESSICA PLATERO,
Secretary/Treasurer.

Mr. GOSAR. I should note, these are significant sums which the Navajo allottees depend on each and every year. According to a 2017 Department of the Interior IG report, 20,855 Navajo allottees receive a collective \$96 million per year from revenues raised through responsible oil and gas development on their allotments. Quite simply, infringing on their right to develop their mineral resources jeopardizes their quality of life.

Further, oil and gas development has blessed the State of New Mexico with significant budget windfalls in recent years. Just last week, the Department of the Interior announced that the State of New Mexico would receive \$1.17 billion in revenues from Federal oil and gas development, the highest disbursement in the State's history.

2018 was a record-breaking year for oil and gas development in New Mexico, with State revenues reaching \$2.2 billion, total. Roughly half of these revenues will return directly to the State's schools, investing in higher pay for teachers and staff, while other

funds were allocated for infrastructure projects and public services.

These funds were provided by oil and gas operations on not only Federal lands, but on State trust lands, as well. Roughly 8 percent of the withdrawal area in this bill is owned by the State of New Mexico and can be developed for the benefit of its citizens. Enacting this bill will cut off the revenue streams from both Federal and State energy development, reducing future revenues for educational initiatives like those signed into law earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, the Chaco Cultural History Park is already protected and off limits to oil and gas development. If leasing were to occur in the surrounding area, it would be subject to a multitude of Federal laws and regulations before any development could begin, including the National Historic Preservation Act, designed to protect culturally significant areas and artifacts on all Federal lands.

Before we declare a permanent ban on energy development in such a large area, we need to have all of the facts. We need to have a complete scientific review and stakeholder engagement process that is already underway. We need to thoroughly weigh the benefits and concerns, and we need to consider all those who are impacted. Not doing so could have significant consequences for the Navajo allottees and for the State of New Mexico's budget and priorities for its citizens.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) in the previous debate, had some incredible charts that he was displaying. In it, he proclaimed: The rocks shall set you free.

I was born and raised, and my faith taught me, that the truth shall set you free, Mr. Chairman. I was also taught that people are entitled to their own opinions, Mr. Chairman, but not their own facts.

If my colleague from Arizona participated in those hearings, as he said he did, he heard the witnesses from the Bureau of Land Management, the witness from the Bureau of Land Management in this direct question about the rights of Navajo allottees being taken away.

Some of my Republican colleagues will argue that protecting Chaco will impact the Navajo allottees' right to develop valid rights. This is blatantly false.

Let the silence sit in. It is false.

The Bureau of Land Management testified before Congress and said that this legislation “would not affect Tribal interests or allottees.”

Mr. Chairman, it is critically important that we have a conversation about

the importance of protecting Chaco. While we have taken steps to defend Chaco, Chaco is at risk of being hurt, of being desecrated, of being destroyed. That is why we have come together.

I would invite my colleague to join us and visit Chaco, visit with the elders, the women who are there, the children who are in proximity of those fumes that my colleague, the chairwoman, DEB HAALAND from New Mexico, was able to describe, where you don't just smell the methane; technology today allows you to see those plumes move into people's homes.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is very clear. It puts in place a practice by the Bureau of Land Management. It takes out of production Federal land.

The lies need to stop about telling our Navajo brothers and sisters who are allottees that this will hurt their access to those lands, that this will restrict access to those lands.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just to be thorough, an amendment that I will offer later today will make it even more clear that this, in fact, is only about taking BLM land out of production.

Mr. Chairman, with all the work that we have left to do with us, this is a piece of legislation supported by the New Mexico delegation, something that, based on the amendment that my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) just offered, might understand. It is supported by myself; the Representative from the district, Congresswoman DEB HAALAND, one of the first two Native American women elected to the Congress—and you heard the passion in her voice; she is carrying the weight of her ancestors on her shoulders as she debates the fight to protect this sacred land—Congresswoman TORRES SMALL, U.S. Senator MARTIN HEINRICH, U.S. Senator TOM UDALL, the Governor of the State of New Mexico, and the Commissioner of Public Lands.

If you need a longer list of elected leaders from New Mexico who support this bill, I can make it available.

Let's work together, Mr. Chairman.

And the last thing I will say is that I am very proud that this legislation will pass with bipartisan support. Pray on it. Think about where our loved ones have been laid to rest. We wouldn't want those grave sites being desecrated. We don't want this sacred site being desecrated either.

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

Mr. Chairman, I love the passion in the gentleman's voice, but, once again, it is not me. It is the allottees who brought their voice forward, the Navajo allottees. They have seen, time and time again, promises made by the Federal Government and promises not kept.

So, once again, who would you rather believe, the allottees or the BLM? Personally, I would side with the allottees.

When you look at the map, it tells you the story you need to know. If we are going to make an amendment, we

should guarantee access through any of that application through this area, not just through the BLM, but all this area, because those are the resources of the State.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Has the gentleman read the bill?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman read the bill, he would see that the text has made very clear this takes Bureau of Land Management land out, not allottee land; and if the gentleman would review the clarifying amendment, he would also see that, as well.

So don't just take my word for it, look at the text and look at the advice of your staff.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, once again, it says it takes it off of mineral exposure, but it doesn't give access.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's presentation here. It is clear and concise, and he raises important points.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act, as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is a flawed bill. It is simply another attempt by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to prevent our country from taking the next steps in this era of American energy dominance.

What is important here is that American energy dominance is a great strategy. It is a strategy that helps all Americans, those in this immediate area and around the country.

The legislation before us will, of course, permanently restrict oil and gas development in the area immediately surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park.

Now, bear in mind, of course, as has been pointed out here, exploration is already restricted within the park; and, of course, that is rightfully so. But it is bad policy to create an arbitrary buffer zone for a prohibition on development in the area around the park.

In this Congress, our friends on the other side of the aisle have made their priorities crystal clear regarding the management of our country's resources. So far, they have placed moratoriums on oil and gas production in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, in the Pacific and Atlantic planning areas, and in ANWR. Apparently, that is not enough. What we are hearing today is that now we need to ban production in the New Mexico areas, as well.

Mr. Chairman, at what point do we say enough is enough?

The evidence shows, time and again, that placing restrictions on energy development only increases prices for American consumers. And make no

mistake, these increases have the largest impact on our most vulnerable communities.

□ 1500

I said this on the floor in September—many of us have—and I will say it again today, the United States is blessed because our land is filled with an abundance of natural resources. My own congressional district back in Louisiana is home of one of the largest natural gas reserves in the country.

We believe, we insist that we have the means and the responsibility to use those God-given resources to create jobs, foster economic growth, and pave the way to an era of American energy dominance. Oppressive policies like the ones before us today have been our own worst enemy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

Ancient civilizations called the area around Chaco Canyon home thousands of years before the earliest settlers of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. In fact, Native American people have occupied this region continuously since 10,000 BC, creating massive public and ceremonial buildings, a complex system of roads for trade, and beautiful crafts and artwork.

Today, there are more than 4,000 archeological sites, millions of artifacts, and countless sacred cultural resources that provide modern-day Native people a direct link to their ancestors who lived in the area thousands of years ago.

Reckless oil and gas development could destroy the fragile archeological and cultural resources in the area, including ones that have not yet been discovered or cataloged. In fact, there has never been a comprehensive Native-led study of the cultural resources in the Chaco region.

It is fitting that we are talking about protecting Chaco Canyon in New Mexico and the Grand Canyon in Arizona on the same day. Both are UNESCO World Heritage sites, and both are national treasures needlessly threatened by industry to pad their bottom line.

That is why I strongly support the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act debated earlier and why I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the 10-mile protection zone around Chaco Canyon's archeological resources and the present-day communities that it creates.

This is sacred ground that we have an obligation to protect for future generations to enjoy and learn about. We must pass this bill to preserve this place to teach our children and our children's children about the rich history and culture of the Native people who lived in the American Southwest.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019.

This unnecessary bill would permanently ban oil and gas development on about 316,000 acres of land in New Mexico. It would also incur \$3 million in increased spending costs with no built-in mechanism to pay for it.

H.R. 2181's proposed landgrab would surround Chaco Culture National Historical Park. The park itself is already under Federal protections, including a prohibition on mineral development. This bill would add 10 extra miles of protected area around the perimeter of the park. This arbitrary addition could have long-term negative repercussions to the State of New Mexico.

H.R. 2181 would also impact the very Navajo Nation members it claims to protect. Many of them own lands and mineral rights in the area that have been passed down for generations, but this bill would make it virtually impossible for them to develop the energy resources to which they are rightfully entitled. The complex puzzle of interlocking Federal, State, Tribal, and private land in the disputed area would result in significant hurdles for the Navajo Nation, creating a de facto extraction ban.

In June of this year, a Navajo Nation representative who owns some of these mineral resources came to Capitol Hill to testify in front of the Natural Resources Committee on behalf of 131 Navajo Nation members about how detrimental H.R. 2181 would be to their land. This bill ignores the request of local landowners and continues the pattern of government overreach in the West.

H.R. 2181 also completely sidesteps the Department of the Interior's resource management plan for the area. This plan is currently undergoing environmental review and will be publicly released at some point. To permanently ban all future energy developments before we know all of the facts and research conclusions is uncalled for.

I have stood here at this podium and spoken at length about American energy dominance and good environmental stewardship because I believe they can go hand in hand. Every indicator we have shows that energy production is becoming cleaner, faster, and cheaper by the day. Refusing to allow safe energy development on Federal land isn't environmentally friendly; it is just bad science and a thinly veiled power grab.

As foreign energy sources become increasingly unpredictable, it is imperative that we tap into our vast domestic energy potential in sustainable ways and that we don't arbitrarily restrict future development.

Keep in mind that any leasing in these areas is subject to a host of Fed-

eral regulations and oversight already. Any development must comply with the National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA. These laws are in place to protect and preserve historically significant sites across our country.

But that is not the issue here. Instead, we are debating areas completely outside the boundaries of the Chaco Culture area. My Democratic colleagues are rushing to pass this bill without hearing the concerns of local Navajo Nation members or waiting to read the Department of the Interior analysis of the area. These hasty conclusions are unnecessary, with potentially devastating effects on New Mexico's revenue stream.

I urge my fellow Members to consider the negative implications of this bill and vote against H.R. 2181.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I simply want to respond to my colleague that was just speaking.

This area is within those exterior boundaries of the archeological sites and findings and indigenous lands that we referred to as Chaco.

I would invite my colleague to come out to New Mexico. I will take the gentleman out there. Congresswoman DEBRA HAALAND would love to host the gentleman.

My colleague from the other side of the aisle brought up this notion that this development is subject to Federal law.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from New Mexico an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman would take a moment and go to the NOAA website, the gentleman would see that New Mexico has two methane clouds over it. We have the two worst methane emissions of anywhere in the country, even though we don't have the most oil and gas production.

I am sorry my colleague is not able to stay for this debate.

Mr. Chairman, right now, there is a theft taking place to U.S. taxpayers because there is intentional leaking of methane that is taking place. You can see it.

There is technology, now, that allows you not just to—when you are out there, Mr. Chairman, you can smell it. But the technology now lets you see these plumes going into people's homes who live right there.

Let's find a way to be smart about this. I agree with that. But there are places we have to protect, and this is one of them.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019.

One thousand years ago, Chaco Canyon was the center of a vibrant ancestral Puebloan culture that became the focal point for ceremonies, for trade, and for political activity in the prehistoric Four Corners area.

Today, thousands of ancestral sites and cultural resources are spread across the Chaco region, while at the same time pump jacks, such as the one shown here, have become increasingly present across the landscape.

Currently, only a small portion of the region's sacred sites and abundant cultural resources are protected within the Chaco Cultural National Historical Park, with much of the surrounding land available for oil and gas development.

The greater Chaco region is a prime example of how sacred sites are facing increased threats from encroaching oil and gas development and the Trump administration's energy dominance agenda. The Bureau of Land Management has already leased over 90 percent of the public land in the larger San Juan Basin for oil and gas extraction, and under the Trump administration, BLM has proposed to lease parcels near Chaco on three different occasions.

Increased fossil fuel extraction not only threatens the region's cultural resources, it also threatens clean air and water, as well as the health and safety of surrounding communities.

New Mexico's methane emissions are already the highest in the country, and it will only get worse if the region is open to increased extraction. That released methane—a greenhouse gas that is 34 times more impactful than CO₂—is a significant contributor to the ongoing climate crisis.

I urge my colleagues to safeguard our Nation against the threat of continued climate change and vote to protect Chaco's unparalleled collection of ancient ruins and the health of local communities from the impacts of oil and gas extraction.

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

I would love to engage with the gentleman from New Mexico if the gentleman would not mind.

Mr. Chair, Members are bringing up this concept of methane capture. There is an easy solution.

Is the gentleman in favor of providing a pipeline, because what ends up happening, we can recover almost 100 percent of the methane emissions when we have a pipeline nearby, because then it becomes profitable and it becomes something that we can actually utilize.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Would it surprise the gentleman from Arizona that they are actually using duct tape to try to seal leaks from methane plumes in New Mexico? Does the gentleman think that is allowed?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I would let the gentleman know that I am one of

these technology nerds. I have been visiting with people who have revolutionized and have new ideas in regard to pipelines that would set this on fire.

So if we are looking at technology, we ought to be looking at in the right way. It is beneficial. We are living longer, not like what we were at the turn of the 1900s, which was shorter.

My point is, if there is technology out there for pipelines that is very consistent with almost 100 percent capture, wouldn't the gentleman entertain that?

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I think the gentleman and I may actually be able to find some common ground.

There are available technologies today—as the gentleman may know, being in tune with modern technology associated with oil and gas exploration—that can identify leaks, can prevent those leaks, and actually can eliminate intentional flaring, but first you have to find them and you have to seal those leaks.

Mr. Chair, I would be happy to work with the gentleman to identify a funding stream so that we can identify every methane leak across America, seal every leak, and prevent intentional methane flaring.

I think there is some common ground we can work on, because this is all about compromise, and this may be an area that—the gentleman, Mr. GOSAR, someone I respect—we might be able to find some common ground.

We will take the gentleman out to New Mexico. We will put the gentleman's eyes on that camera where the gentleman can see the plumes moving. And while they may try to fix it temporarily with duct tape—sometimes on the farm we do it with baling wire, as the gentleman knows—we should use real technology, eliminate those leaks, eliminate those plumes, and actually make it illegal to intentionally flare. Let's find common ground on that.

Does the gentleman know why they flare the methane? That is stealing from taxpayers.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I have no problem. What I would ask in return is let's turn around and go back to Petra Nova down in Texas where we have a coal-fired plant that actually captures 100 percent of any emissions. It takes it down into the gas areas and actually injects it back in, squeegeeing what the rest of the oil and gas is, and then it condenses into limestone. It is pretty interesting technology.

So I appreciate the gentleman for his back-and-forth, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to have my voice heard in support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

This proposal that is sponsored by my friend, Mr. LUJÁN, with the support

of the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, Representative HAALAND, also from New Mexico, is another important step towards recognizing and elevating the voices and the presence of Native communities in this Chamber.

As the chairwoman mentioned in her opening statement, our committee has heard from Puebloan and Tribal leaders throughout this Congress about how important it is to protect Chaco. These communities want to see Chaco, their ancestral homeland, protected from oil and gas drilling.

This is an important piece of legislation. It is an agreed-upon proposal that balances regional development with the needs to ensure that special places and, indeed, sacred places are off limits. It fits well into the work this Chamber is doing today and has been doing all Congress. We are listening to diverse voices, protecting the rights of Native communities, and conserving our public lands for the benefit of current and future generations.

Mr. Chair, I hope our colleagues will join us in this important work by voting today to protect irreplaceable sites that are important to Native communities and supported by folks on the ground and that are critical to the story of this Nation of ours.

□ 1515

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), who is the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is wonderful to be back down here on the floor again with all of you. I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for that. I would have been here earlier had the gentleman not scheduled a hearing on our committee at the same time as we are supposed to have all our committee bills here on the floor. But we hit both of those at any rate.

We have three bills on the floor here today—I'm really sorry I missed the first one—three bills that are so bad they make the umpire last night actually look good.

This particular one has one of those problems that still exists. If the State of New Mexico or New Mexico's leaders want to give away the \$1.17 billion they just got a check from last time from this development, that is okay with me. Actually, it probably means that more money is going to come to my State eventually from that pot. But it is not okay to forget that those people who really understand what they are talking about, those who live closely in the area, really need to have their voices heard, specifically.

I have to equate, once again, as has been brought up already, but I want to reemphasize, the two chapters in closest proximity that really have an impact on here both voted against this bill. They both sent resolutions against this bill. Those who actually have seen what it is like to deal with the Federal

Government on that personal basis have sent resolutions against this bill.

This bill has the potential of disrupting 20,000 Native Americans—almost all Navajo—who are allottees in this particular area. Even though some will contend that the Federal Government has said they will not be a problem, if we look at the history of dealing with the Federal Government, then, obviously, the concerns that the private sector has and those citizens who live in this area have for this bill are pretty obvious. There is historical precedence on when that should take place, and until there is some kind of verification of that, then we ought to be very careful in which way we decide to go in this particular order.

Let me also say one other thing here, because this is a frustration I have with the entire process. As we know, bad procedure creates bad policy. But the bill that we have just discussed dealt with a park that has a huge maintenance backlog. Even though changing the mining procedures around the park will have nothing to do with the water, it certainly doesn't solve the maintenance backlog. This bill will all deal with withdrawals from the Bureau of Land Management lands which, once again, have a huge maintenance backlog. So I am going to say, once again, to our friends on the other side, if you really want to talk about parklands in Arizona, BLM lands in New Mexico, and whatever those lands in Colorado are going to be, all on the same day, and we have that huge maintenance backlog, then for heaven's sakes, bring that bill onto the floor. I realize how controversial it may be. There are only 328 cosponsors of the bill. I am sure that probably would be able to go on suspension.

But until we have actually addressed the maintenance backlog and not held that up as some kind of sad quid pro quo or sad element of trying to blackmail for something else or try to attach bad elements to it that will actually negate the impact of that bill, we are piddling around here. Bring that bill for the maintenance backlog to the floor. Let us have a vote. Let us move on to solve real problems instead of those that we are creating with these three bills that are going to be before us today.

Are they terrible bills?

Who knows?

Will they result in better quality in other Western States that have public lands?

Who knows?

Are some of the Native Americans who live in that area very sceptical of it?

Obviously.

Is there a history of the inability of working these things out?

Obviously.

Should they have worked out the details with the BLM before we actually introduced land?

Yes, obviously.

But, once again, Mr. Chairman, we have three bills that make that play on

first base look really good in comparison.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, as we heard, Chaco Canyon is a UNESCO World Heritage site, and the reason it is listed this way is because it is a place of magic and history. Anyone who has slept there under the stars, as I have, and as I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do, knows what a special and unique place this is and why it must be protected.

But there are many ways one can damage an historic site. Obviously, you can damage the very soil that it sits on. But you can also damage the air quality that the visitors to this site find every year.

Oil and gas development produces smog and gas flares that harm animals, vegetation, and people who live nearby. It also undermines the park's pristine night skies that attract thousands of visitors every year. It emits methane that leads to harmful ground-level ozone pollution, and it is just not worth destroying this precious treasure.

I support reasonable oil and gas development throughout the West in my State, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and so many places. But just because we should have oil and gas development in appropriate places doesn't mean we should have it everywhere, certainly not near or in Chaco Canyon. That is why I support this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to reiterate a number of institutions that are against H.R. 2181. To preface that, we set precedents and we codify precedents. So that is why, Mr. Chairman, you will have multiple States disagreeing with H.R. 2181.

So for those who are against H.R. 2181, you have the American Exploration and Mining Association, there is a group letter; Arizona Liberty, group letter; Arizona Mining Association, group letter; Arizona Pork Producers, group letter; Arizona Rock Products Association; group letter; Conservatives for Property Rights, a letter; Denver Lumber Company, a letter; EnCore Energy Corporation; Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson, a letter; New Mexico Business Coalition, a letter; New Mexico Cattle Growers Association; New Mexico Federal Lands Council; New Mexico Wool Growers Association; Western Energy Alliance; and Women's Mining Coalition. These are just some of the people who are against it.

When we look at this board, we have this designation, you see it here in Chaco Canyon.

What wisdom did they have when they first put this together?

That is what I want to ask. The dimensions here are for a reason.

Why are we expending this, particularly when there is so little trust in the Federal Government?

I think we have just realized that we had to move a part of our government—I think the BLM, if I remember right—out to Grand Junction, Colorado, so that we actually had some bureaucrats who actually understood the dilemmas that are out there in Western culture and in Western States.

Yes, Western States gave up a lot. They gave a lot up compared to our Eastern cohorts. We gave property to the Federal Government for stewardship, however, that has been abused. The products that we were supposed to get off those lands as public lands have dwindled.

Eastern States call us beggars in regard to payment in lieu of taxes because we can't tax these Federal lands. And we are begging for pennies on the dollar.

Something is wrong with that.

We are also vested in the community application of the best management of these resources and getting the highest yield out of it. It is like an investment.

How do we get the best out of this area?

When you look at this, no wonder the Navajo allottees don't trust the Federal Government. Tell me when the Federal Government has honored their promise.

Look at the Navajo generating station in Arizona. This was a promise to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes to have work that was dependent upon them, that gave them the benefits of that entrepreneurship and that reflection of minerals. Sixty percent of the Navajo economy is based off of the Navajo generating station at the mine. That is gone. Eighty percent of the Hopis on the mine and NGS. That is gone. So it is no wonder these Navajo allottees don't trust the Federal Government. I don't blame them.

Trust is a series of promises kept. Until we can start honoring our promises, we have got to stop this foolishness. There is plenty of land there. I want to see my sites, but I also want my energy, too. There is a way of going about it.

We engaged with the gentleman from New Mexico. It is going to be a wonderful aspect to start talking about technology in regard to recouping 100 percent of the methane and anything else that comes out of it.

I do come from northern Arizona where I can see the stars. I don't want to ever lose sight of that, because I think it was Buzz Lightyear who said: To infinity and beyond. That is the way we should also be.

But it is not about victimization, it is about empowerment. I believe these Navajo allottees deserve their rights to make sure that the government honors their promise. I want cultural sites to be honored. But I wonder what the difference is when this site is held in this parameter and why we are going about the business to expand it even further.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. LUJAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, because one of the resolutions from the two chapters was raised, and think it was raised by the gentleman as well, so I just wanted to make sure we had a chance to review that.

So if that resolution is reviewed, if the gentleman would look at paragraph 4, which is where the concern that was brought up by the allottees to the very distinguished and honorable chapter leaders was raised, what it says is this: "Navajo allotment landowners expressed their concerns that the 'Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018' might infringe on their royalty payments they are presently benefiting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands. Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation, has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefits to their daily lives."

The Bureau of Land Management did provide assurance that there would be no impact to those royalty payments.

So to answer the question of might infringe, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management have said absolutely not would there be any infringement. So I appreciate the gentleman's time, and I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that. But, once again, trust is a series of promises kept.

When has the Federal Government held their trust up to the Tribal men or even allottees?

It doesn't matter if they are Native American. We have had a number of mining claims that have been stymied because the Forest Service or the BLM will not give them access, even though they have allowed and stated that they would have access to that claim.

So, once again, it is a hollow promise; and, once again, I beseech individuals until the government starts honoring promises, they are not entitled to the hierarchy of trust. That is just it. I trust people more than I do the government. A government that can give all can take all. I'm not for that. I'm for empowerment. I'm not for victimization.

What I have seen, I don't like. I have seen that the promise to the Navajo people and to the Hopi people is lame.

We are going to take these good-paying jobs in northern Arizona, and we are going to give them welfare?

How discouraging is that?

Does that lift a person's spirit?

No, it doesn't.

It doesn't give them upward mobility. I thought that was the American experience. It is sad that we are at this point in time. I think we need to have

more dialogue on these bills. We need to have more discussions. Yes, the ranking member made the comment: good process, builds good policy, builds good politics. None of that exists right now. None of that exists.

Until we get back to the civil debate on this, it continually won't exist.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2181 is a broadly supported proposal to protect the cultural resources of Chaco Canyon. This bill has the support of the All Pueblo Council of Governors, the Navajo Nation, the entire New Mexico delegation, and the New Mexico Governor, not to mention any number of elected officials across our beautiful State.

This proposal has been worked on for a very long time. Over many hours, weeks, and years, many voices have been heard. If we are serious about lifting up Tribal voices and responding to the priorities of Native American communities, we need to listen to the Tribal leaders who are asking us to protect Chaco Canyon. The people of New Mexico know the impacts oil and gas development can have on clean air, clean water, and the health of our children.

Mr. Chair, 90 percent of the San Juan Basin is already available for oil and gas leasing. We can protect this sacred land because gas and oil doesn't need to take up every single inch of our State. This proposal is about protecting a small sacred area for Tribal communities that have a connection to this special place and still use this area for ceremonies to pray and to worship.

There may be dissenting voices, as there always are when we make changes to land management policy, but we must listen to the elected leaders who represent these places. Quite frankly, the majority of New Mexicans support this legislation on this issue.

The delegation, the Governor, and the elected Tribal leaders have spoken in a unified voice and asked us to protect Chaco Canyon. I thank Representative LUJÁN for his hard work.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2181, and I invite anyone to come to New Mexico and visit this beautiful place and know for certain why it is that we are fighting so hard to protect it.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I include the following letters in the RECORD.

WESTERN CAUCUS, CHAIRMAN PAUL GOSAR
OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2181

So far H.R. 2181 is opposed by: American Exploration & Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Liberty (Group Letter), Arizona Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Pork Producers (Group Letter), Arizona Rock Products Association (Group Letter), Citizens For America (Group Letter), Conservative Coalition of Northern Arizona (Group Letter), Conservatives for Property

Rights (Letter), Denver Lumber Company (Letter), enCore Energy Corp (Letter), Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson (Letter), New Mexico Business Coalition (Letter), New Mexico Cattle Growers Association (Letter), New Mexico Federal Lands Council (Letter), New Mexico Wool Growers Association (Letter), Western Energy Alliance (Letter), Women's Mining Coalition (Group Letter).

JULY 16, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP: I write to you today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2181, the "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019". This bill permanently bans oil, natural gas, coal and other minerals from federal leasing and future development on 316,000 acres in New Mexico while also permanently terminating leases in the area that have yet to go into production.

H.R. 2181 places our economic and energy security at risk by putting an area rich in oil and gas resources permanently off limits to production. This bill will harm tribal members, reduce general fund and education revenues infringe on private property rights and negatively impact local economies.

The area in question has proven to hold large reserves of oil and gas resources. BLM recognized the potential in this area and proposed to include several parcels near Chaco Canyon in its oil and gas lease sale on March 28, 2019.

The so-called "buffer zone" imposed by this bill is completely unnecessary, as oil and gas production has taken place in this area for decades, with no damage to the national park. In fact, the expressed purpose of the park was to protect the culturally significant ruins and great houses of the Chaco people, and the boundaries of the park were drawn for that very goal.

H.R. 2181 will harm education. In fiscal year 2018, oil and natural gas production generated \$2.2 billion for New Mexico's general fund and accounted for one-third of all revenue in the fund. More than \$820 million of these funds flowed to K-12 schools, providing enough revenues enough to cover the salaries of nearly 11,500 teachers.

It was clear from the manner in which the committee treated this bill that the voices of tribal members were not adequately considered. In fact, no allottees were invited to speak at the site visit or at the subcommittee hearing in New Mexico discussing this legislation.

Delora Hesuse, a Navajo with private mineral rights in New Mexico, claims the concerns of Indian allottees have not been heard and that the proposed 316,000-acre "buffer" is a solution in search of a problem. According to Western Wire, Hesuse stated, "How come we don't have a voice in this? . . . Environmentalists and others claiming to speak on their behalf have 'not even consulted us or asked our permission . . . Her fellow allottees were passed over for [opponents] and environmental activists and not included in the panel discussions at the field hearings. We oppose the buffer zone because it's never been an issue. Everyone knew their boundaries. She said residents near Chaco have been receiving royalties since the 1970s and they don't want that critical income to go away."

H.R. 2181 imposes an assault on Indian allottees that hold private mineral rights in the withdrawal area and tramples on property rights. This bill makes their assets

worthless, taking away valuable royalty payments from these impoverished communities. To put this in perspective, in 2015 alone, the Federal Indian Minerals Office distributed \$96 million to 20,835 allottees throughout the country.

Allottees in the Chaco region have consistently expressed opposition to this proposed withdrawal. Instead of listening to all local voices, the proponents of this bill have pandered to environmental groups who claim to represent all the relevant stakeholders on this matter, but clearly do not.

There are already numerous federal and state laws and regulations on the books that adequately protect the Chaco National Park. The oil and gas industry has both a legal and moral obligation to protect the artifacts of the Chaco people, as well as avoiding impacts on newly discovered artifacts, which it has always done. American energy production and protecting the environment are not mutually exclusive goals. Chaco will continue to be protected while responsible oil and gas production occurs, benefitting education and reducing carbon emissions in the process.

Again, I oppose H.R. 2181 and urge its rejection.

Sincerely,

BUSTER D. JOHNSON,
Mohave County Supervisor, District III.

IPAA
INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA
October 25, 2019.

Hon. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP: The Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) strongly opposes H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act. IPAA did not object when Interior Secretary Bernhardt issued a one-year freeze on leasing in order to complete the ongoing Resource Management Plan (RMP) in the area. We believe it is important to have all the facts before making any land management decision involving public lands. However, despite the fact that the RMP has not yet been released, House Democratic leadership plans to bring H.R. 2181 to the floor for a vote in the coming weeks. This legislation is premature and locks-up land in the region before we have all the facts from the RMP. This bill would permanently ban federal oil and natural gas leasing on roughly 316,000 acres of land in New Mexico and terminate existing leases. It is bad policy to act before we know the facts.

While the sponsors of this legislation claim it will not affect Native American allottee mineral rights, the reality is far different. H.R. 2181 will create significant access and extraction complications for the Tribal allottees along with any companies they partner with and will lead to a de facto mineral extraction ban on their lands.

At a June 5, 2019 hearing in the Natural Resources Committee on the legislation, a witness with allottee land from the Navajo Nation, Nageezi chapter testified against the bill stating that H.R. 2181 would "put many of our mineral rights off limits and stop a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, clothe and protect our families." The witness also submitted for the record a petition signed by 131 Navajo allottees opposing this legislation, as well as two resolutions

from the Huerfano and Nageezi Navajo chapters, which are closest to this area, expressing support for the Navajo allotment landowners and recognizing their opposition to this bill.

IPAA has been content to let the Chaco Canyon RMP process proceed to its conclusion. However, we cannot support any efforts to increase the area's boundary before all the RMP is completed. The main purpose of establishing the Chaco Culture National Historical Area was to protect every area of historical significance. That goal has been accomplished. Extending the boundaries and adding acreage to the Heritage Area will not enhance protection of areas of historical significance. There are no areas outside the currently designated boundaries that qualify for protections. However, the park expansion would have economically devastating impacts on those who live closest to the area.

For these reasons, IPAA urges you to vote "NO" on H.R. 2181.

Sincerely,

DANIEL T. NAATZ,
Senior Vice President, Government
Relations and Political Affairs,
Independent Petroleum Association of
America.

WESTERN ENERGY ALLIANCE

July 16, 2019.

Hon. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP: Western Energy Alliance strongly opposes H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act. This bill permanently bans new federal oil and natural gas leasing and development on 316,000 acres in New Mexico while also terminating existing leases.

H.R. 2181 puts at risk the local economy and the livelihoods of thousands of Indian allottees in the area by making it very difficult if not impossible for them to develop the energy resources they own. While the bill purports to leave Indian allottees unaffected, the reality is that the interlocking nature of the federal and allottee estates means that companies will avoid developing in the area. With today's horizontal drilling of two-mile laterals it is not possible to avoid the federal mineral estate while still producing on pockets of allottee minerals. If the bill passes, companies will have no recourse but to avoid developing Indian allottee energy resources.

For this reason, Indian allottees oppose this bill. When Indian allottee Delora Hesuse testified before the committee in June, she attached to her testimony petitions with signatures of other allottees who also oppose the threat to their families' oil and natural gas income. As she testified, the money she and 20,835 other Indian allottees earn from their energy property is about \$96 million annually. That huge source of income in an area otherwise plagued by unemployment and poverty is threatened by this bill.

The area containing the highly productive Mancos Shale that would be excluded from federal development has been proven to hold large reserves of oil and natural gas. But the exclusionary zone imposed by this bill is completely unnecessary, as oil and natural gas production has taken place in this area for decades, with no damage to the national park. In fact, the expressed purpose of the park boundaries is to protect the culturally significant ruins and great houses of the Chaco people.

We urge the committee not to pass this bill. Thank you for considering our input.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN M. SGAMMA,
President.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part D of House Report 116-264 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2181

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 "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) there are archeological, sacred, and historic resources located throughout the Greater Chaco region, which spans the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado;

(2) the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, a unit of the National Park System and a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization World Heritage Site, is known around the world—

(A) for multi-story buildings constructed by the Chacoan people that are still standing; and

(B) as the nerve center of a culture that spread throughout and dominated the Four Corners area during the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries;

(3) the Chacoan people built hundreds of miles of roads and a network of villages, shrines, and communications sites, many of which are still visible;

(4) many Pueblos and Indian Tribes in the Four Corners area claim cultural affiliation with, and are descended from, the Chacoan people;

(5) the landscape around the Chaco Culture National Historical Park includes hundreds of internationally and nationally significant cultural resources, including prehistoric roads, communities, and shrines—

(A) many of which are related to the resources found in the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, including the resources recognized by the amendment made by section 3 of the Chacoan Outliers Protection Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 410i note; Public Law 104-11) providing for additional Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites;

(B) a significant number of which are concentrated within the immediate area surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(C) that are commonly recognized by archeologists;

(6) long considered one of the best places for stargazing in the world, Chaco Culture National Historical Park—

(A) in 1991, established a night skies protection initiative and interpretive program to protect the night sky in the area of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(B) in 2013, was certified as an International Dark Sky Park;

(7) the Greater Chaco landscape in the State of New Mexico extends beyond Chaco Culture National Historical Park and encompasses—

(A) local communities, including Pueblos and Indian Tribes; and

(B) public land, which includes additional cultural resources and sacred sites;

(8) for over 110 years, the Federal Government has recognized the importance of the area in which the Chacoan people lived and has acted to protect historic and sacred sites in the area, including—

(A) Chaco Canyon, which was designated as a National Monument in 1907 and as the Chaco Culture National Historical Park in 1980;

(B) the Aztec Ruins, which was designated as a National Monument in 1923 and expanded in each of 1928, 1930, 1948, and 1988; and

(C) the 39 Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites designated in 1995;

(9) recognizes that the standard for Tribal consultation is outlined in Executive Order 13175 (25 U.S.C. 5301 note; relating to consultation and coordination with Indian Tribal governments);

(10) extensive natural gas development has occurred in the Greater Chaco region that affect the health, safety, economies, and quality of life of local communities;

(11) renewed interest in oil exploration and production within the Mancos/Gallup Shale play has increased the potential for—

(A) significant impacts on resources and visitor experiences at the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(B) additional impacts on local communities in the Greater Chaco region, including Pueblos and Indian Tribes;

(12) a mineral withdrawal in the landscape around the Chaco Culture National Historical Park would prevent leasing and development in the immediate area surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, which would protect resources and visitor experiences at the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(13) additional studies and protective measures should be undertaken to address health, safety, and environmental impacts on communities and interests of Pueblos and Indian Tribes in the Greater Chaco landscape.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term "covered lease" means any oil and gas lease for Federal land—

(A) on which drilling operations have not been commenced before the end of the primary term of the applicable lease;

(B) that is not producing oil or gas in paying quantities; and

(C) that is not subject to a valid cooperative or unit plan of development or operation certified by the Secretary to be necessary.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "Federal land" means—

(i) any Federal land or interest in Federal land that is within the boundaries of the Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area, as depicted on the Map; and

(ii) any land or interest in land located within the boundaries of the Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area, as depicted on the Map, that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term "Federal land" does not include trust land (as defined in section 3765 of title 38, United States Code).

(3) MAP.—The term "Map" means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area" and dated April 2, 2019.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any valid existing rights, the Federal land is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be made available for inspection at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO INDIAN TRIBES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may convey the Federal land to, or exchange the Federal land with, an Indian Tribe in accordance with a resource management plan that is approved as of the date of enactment of this Act, as subsequently developed, amended, or revised in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and any other applicable law.

SEC. 5. OIL AND GAS LEASE MANAGEMENT.

(a) TERMINATION OF NON-PRODUCING LEASES.—A covered lease—

(1) shall automatically terminate by operation of law pursuant to section 17(e) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(e)) and subpart 3108 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

(2) may not be extended by the Secretary.

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF TERMINATED, RELINQUISHED, OR ACQUIRED LEASES.—Any portion of the Federal land subject to a covered lease terminated under subsection (a) or otherwise or relinquished or acquired by the United States on or after the date of enactment of this Act is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent undermining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 6. EFFECT.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; or

(2) precludes improvements to, or rights-of-way for water, power, or road development on, the Federal land to assist communities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Federal land.

SEC. 7. 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, is in order except those printed in part E of House Report 116-264. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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. LUJÁN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

Mr. LUJÁN. 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:

Page 6, line 25, insert “on Federal lands and of Federal minerals” after “development”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I am optimistic that this amendment may even pass on a voice vote because I have been listening closely to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about the importance of providing clarifying language to ensure that we are able to make sure that we are meeting the goals that we have laid out.

So I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that this may be a short debate, but one that will definitely pass and make sure that we are embracing both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment would further clarify that this proposal only withdraws Federal resources. The withdrawal in H.R. 2181 would not impact nor remove valid existing rights. This includes any lands and minerals owned by a Tribe or a member of a Tribe, including allotment land, and it will include any valid rights to lands or minerals held by the State of New Mexico.

I introduced this bill to prevent further encroachment of Federal oil and gas development on the sacred sites of the greater Chaco Canyon region. These sites have withstood the test of time, 800 A.D. They have stood for thousands of years and give us a window into the past.

Yet, every year, oil and gas development on Federal lands inch closer and closer, threatening these sites and thousands of ancient artifacts within the region. The Chaco Culture National Historical Park has significant religious, cultural, and archaeological value to the original peoples of the Southwest.

Under this administration, Chaco does continue to face greater threats. Under the Trump administration, the BLM has proposed to sell leases near Chaco Canyon three times since March 2018. But I will also give some credit to the administration. Each time, under the Trump administration, the sales were withdrawn by the BLM under the Department of the Interior after pushback from the Native American communities. And each time, the administration promised meaningful consultation, which is living up to our trust responsibility, something that I shared with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. Sadly, the meaningful consultation never took place, yet the leases were up again for sale only months later.

It is time for Congress to heed the interest of the communities across New

Mexico that want to see the site protected and withdraw the Federal lands and minerals across Chaco Canyon.

As you have seen and heard, 90 percent of the San Juan Basin is already open to drilling. Oil and gas rights are not under threat here.

I understand that concerns have been raised by allottees who worry this bill will impact their ability to develop their rights. But as I said earlier, the bill clearly protects them.

If my colleagues have any concerns, this amendment provides further clarifying language to ensure that those protections are very clear.

This proposal will not impact anyone's ability to develop their valid rights, including Navajo allottees. This amendment makes it clear that the legislation only affects Federal Government land and minerals owned.

Let's be clear: My legislation supports the interests of Tribes and their sovereignty. H.R. 2181 is well-supported by Native American communities. The proposal has received the support of the All Pueblo Council of Governors representing 20 Pueblos and the Navajo Nation.

Leaders were at the table for every step of this process, helping to decide how these resources should be protected. I will forever remember the conversations I had with Navajo elders and children who continue to share their concerns associated with protecting the sacred site.

I will just close, Mr. Chairman, by reminding us once again that when we lay our loved ones to rest, we will do everything we can to protect those sacred sites. This weekend, I found myself next to the Nambe Church in the community where I live, half a mile away from where I rest my head, remembering those who have fallen, cleaning those sites, pulling up the weeds, raking the ground, paying my respects. I can't imagine how my mom or I would feel if those places would be desecrated.

That is all that we are asking. Let's come together. Let's protect these sacred sites. Let's do it together.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, when I look at this, I see the aptitude to try to amend this to give access. I have to tell the gentleman, though, it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. Chair, I think what we have to do is guarantee access so that Congress is specifically and intentionally demanding that they have that access because you know as well as I know that, once again, government problems exist. I will give the gentleman an example.

In the last land package, we have a land package that included the La Paz

land exchange by BLM. Do you know what the big problem now has been? It was signed into law. It has been about access. Our legislation actually said that it did not impugn any of the mineral estates, but then the BLM came back and said, listen, that doesn't guarantee you access to it.

That is why I think it doesn't go far enough.

I would love to see it say that it requires the allottees access to those lands. But I am not opposed to it. I think it slightly makes it better.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I, too, am actually in support of the amendment. I think it is an improvement on the bill, but it doesn't go far enough because it is still only amending the findings.

If you really want teeth with it, you have to amend the statutes whatsoever. So for that, it is an improvement, but it still does not solve the base problem that even if you are taking away rights on Federal property and you have private rights that abut it, that has an impact on those private rights at the same time.

Those are the types of things that need to be guaranteed because those are the people that could be losing tens of thousands of dollars because the action on the Federal land has an impact on the private land that abuts it at the same time. And that cannot be solved in a finding.

However, the language that you put in here is a good effort to try and at least clarify what Congress hopes to be accomplishing. For that, I commend the gentleman for actually presenting this particular amendment. I am happy to be able to vote for it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I think we need to devolve this back to the people of interest, the Native peoples, the people of the State, the private owners.

Mr. Chair, I lay no opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, just to close, I very much appreciate the attention that was brought to section 6 of the amendment, which very clearly states that nothing in this act, number one, affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; or, number two, precludes improvements to or rights-of-way for water, power, or road development under Federal lands to assist communities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Federal land.

I very much respect my colleague and the former chair of the committee, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. GOSAR, and I look forward to continuing to work with them.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

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:

Page 9, beginning on line 8, strike "TO INDIAN TRIBES".

Page 9, line 11, insert "or a State trust land entity" after "Indian Tribe".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, 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, this amendment would allow Federal lands included in the withdrawal area to be conveyed or exchanged with State trust entities, as well as Native American Tribes.

Currently, over one-third of the land in New Mexico is owned by the Federal Government. The 316,000-acre withdrawal this bill creates includes substantial parcels of Native American-owned private land and State trust lands.

State trust lands are an essential part of funding public services in the West, especially education. However, Federal overreach, such as this legislation, puts that funding at risk. Allowing the conveyance of certain lands in the withdrawal to State trust agencies and private businesses will help to mitigate the effects of this withdrawal on essential public services and local infrastructure.

Allowing the conveyance of federally held land will also go a long way to addressing one of the critical problems with this legislation, which is access. Denying access to these lands to private landowners and Native American allottees is simply wrong. The growing Federal estate is not a good thing for the long-term future of the West.

Instead of locking up more land, like the majority is trying to do today, we should be focused on increasing multiple use on public lands. We can have our cake, and we can eat it, too.

To put it simply, instead of needlessly locking up more land, we should be focused on unlocking the potential of the West, empowering people to enjoy it.

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1545

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, there is a little bit of irony on this amendment that, again, I can't overlook, and we raised it a little bit earlier.

The previous debate, which was around protecting the Grand Canyon, included an argument from my colleague that there should be some support for the Member whose district that we were debating.

Earlier, the gentleman from Arizona offered an amendment to an Arizona public lands bill that would have removed the lands in his district from the bill. Yet here we have a bill in New Mexico, in the Third Congressional District that I so proudly represent, which is supported by the Governor of the State of New Mexico and by the entire New Mexico delegation, and the gentleman from Arizona is still trying to make those changes—changes, I would offer, that don't make a bit of difference when it comes to the substantive side of the bill.

This amendment would not improve the bill. In fact, it would make it harder for Tribal communities to protect the lands this bill was intended to preserve.

The gentleman claims that he wants to ensure the State has access to the lands in the withdrawal zone so that they can potentially earn revenue on these lands.

Well, there is something that has happened in the State of New Mexico over the last many years. In New Mexico, the State Land Office, which has jurisdiction over these lands, has placed a moratorium on these lands within the buffer zone because the State recognizes the importance of protecting Chaco Canyon.

It is important that Congress do the same. We need to recognize that the importance of these sacred homelands does not end at the boundaries of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, a claim that was falsely made by my colleagues earlier today.

The entire greater Chaco region contains discovered and undiscovered cultural resources important to Pueblo communities, to Tribal communities, to our brothers and sisters who have a connection to this region. We need to create this protection zone to ensure that these resources are not disturbed or destroyed by future oil and gas exploration on Federal lands.

As my colleagues have noted, even Secretary Bernhardt agrees with this sentiment. That is the Secretary of the Interior under the Trump administration. That is why he and the administration worked with U.S. Senator of New Mexico MARTIN HEINRICH to agree to a 1-year withdrawal around the Chaco region to allow Congress to act on these protections for these sites.

So I want to thank my colleagues for taking the initiative to act within the allotted time that was given to us by the Secretary of the Interior.

This amendment ignores the importance of these resources, ignores the desires of the State, and would make it harder for Native communities to protect their lands.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for the time today. I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, but

I hope to continue to work with my colleagues in the Congress so we can get to adoption of this important legislation with as strong a bipartisan vote as possible.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not from New Mexico, but I do have an interest in education because that was one of the standard operating procedures that we were promised on public land.

If I am not mistaken, the Tribes are beneficiaries, as well, of that educational fund. And so, when you start looking at this, depriving that fund of its due resources—I don't know about New Mexico, but Arizona has got a problem paying for its educational system. It is not because we don't have enough money; it is because we don't have enough land. That is a problem.

I am here on behalf of the beneficiaries that the government promised. So, from that standpoint, I don't see a dichotomy in the argument until we can understand, until we have a better facilitation of that exchange, once again, doing something expediently, as we had the discussion earlier about access to those allottees.

Once again, government hasn't been the solution that it had claimed to be. We almost have to guide them hand and foot, pushing them to the right decision.

Mr. Chair, I still rise in favor of this amendment, and 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. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

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. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that the Secretary of the Interior finds that the withdrawal under section 4 shall not impact the ability to develop or the economic value of the mineral rights held by Native Americans in the Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area or the greater Chaco region.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, 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, this amendment would ensure this bill

would not take effect if the withdrawal in question is proven to affect development or economic value of Native American mineral rights on allotments.

Private property rights are a fundamental American ideal. The 316,000-acre withdrawal this bill creates includes substantial parcels of privately held land, much of which is owned by Native American allottees.

The benefits of owning mineral rights are obvious for Native communities. In 2015 alone, the Federal Indian Mineral Office distributed \$96 million to more than 20,000 allottees around the country.

At the June 5, 2019, hearing on H.R. 2181, the Committee on Natural Resources heard testimony from Delora Hesuse, a citizen of the Navajo Nation, Nageezi chapter, and a Navajo allottee, who owns mineral resources in the proposed area.

Ms. Hesuse testified that H.R. 2181 would "put many of our mineral rights off limits and stop a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, clothe, and protect our families."

Apparently, the voices of Ms. Hesuse and other allottees who have spoken to the committee have not been heard. This amendment is an effort to acknowledge that their livelihoods could be drastically diminished by this legislation.

I ask the Members of this body to put themselves in the shoes of the Native American allottees who have staked their livelihood on the mineral rights on their properties that are rightfully theirs, only to have the Federal Government strip them of their rights. I believe that is an injustice.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment because it would allow Secretary Bernhardt to kill this bill, preventing protections for the important cultural sites at Chaco Canyon.

In response to this amendment, I would point you to the text of H.R. 2181. The bill text states: "Nothing in this act affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe or trust land or allotment land."

It could not be any clearer than that; yet we have had this debate in hearings, in markups, and even moments ago during debate and in amendments.

I understand and appreciate the concerns of the Navajo allottees, and I appreciated when Ms. Hesuse came before our committee to share her concerns with us. It is important that we take these perspectives into consideration, which is why I appreciate Representative LUJÁN's effort to make explicitly clear that this bill will have no impact on the rights of allotted owners.

But, at the same time, we need to listen to the voices of Native communities and their elected leaders, who are calling on us to protect Chaco Canyon.

We have heard it already today, but this bill receives the complete support of the Navajo Nation and the All Pueblo Council of Governors, which represents 19 pueblos in New Mexico and 1 in Texas.

These Tribal leaders want to see the Chaco landscape protected from oil and gas drilling. They don't want to see cultural sites damaged by pump jacks or to have the pollution of extraction intrude on these sacred sites.

The restrictions in this proposal are not new. They have been informally in place for years under the Obama administration without any clear impact on any allottees.

We need to act now to formalize these protections because the Trump administration and their energy dominance agenda threaten these important resources. Lease sales have been offered around Chaco Canyon three times since March of 2018.

We must listen to the voices of Tribal communities and protect Chaco Canyon.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would have loved to hear that argument in the discussion on ANWR. That would have been interesting to have.

When I look at this, it has become very evident, in my time here in Congress, to find programs that had no authorization by Congress that were enacted. Interesting. Interesting, once again, in a government that is not trusted.

Trust is a series of promises kept. Once again, this reiterates the private property ownership of these allottees to make sure that it is not impugned. I do not see the definition of that causing a quandary.

Once again, these are allottees who are deserving for us to require to make sure that they are held whole.

So, once again, I find it shortsighted in the application that the other side doesn't want to accept this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I wish everyone would vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, we have heard this argument. We have hashed and rehashed it over and over again. Not only that, but my colleague, Mr. LUJÁN, said it very plainly: The allottees will not be hampered by H.R. 2181.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and 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. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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, add the following:

SEC. 7. CONTINUING OPERATIONS.

Operators may continue new oil and gas developments in the exclusionary zone proposed by this Act if those operators have previously been in accordance with the provisions of law formerly known as the "National Historic Preservation Act" and have not violated the existing rules and regulations for the archeological sites and areas of sensitivity in the Chaco Canyon Historical Park.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a Navajo saying that a rocky vineyard does not need a prayer but a pickax.

We don't need protectionist prayers from elites in Washington who think they have all the answers; we need a pickax for prosperity and opportunity for folks living in rural America and the Navajo people in New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

My amendment would prevent the proposed ban on future oil and gas development from going into effect in an area that already has adequate protections, protections that are there to ensure that these operations won't have any adverse impact on historic and sacred lands in the Chaco Canyon Historic Park.

The reality is there are already a litany of State and Federal laws in place to ensure environmental protection and to prevent mineral development from affecting sensitive infrastructure and sacred artifacts within this exclusion zone.

Energy companies have had a positive track record when it comes to working with the Federal Government to comply with these laws for necessary permits and approvals. And, since producers already meet the standards set in several comprehensive environmental laws, this proposed ban on new oil and gas development in this area, in my opinion, is unnecessary, is misguided, and is overreaching.

In fact, drilling for minerals already prohibited within the Chaco Canyon Historic Park, keeping the culturally sensitive artifacts safe from any sort of

potential disturbance caused by oil and gas development, this bill is nothing more than a buffer zone on top of an already existing buffer zone that has protected cultural artifacts effectively for 100 years, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1600

Unfortunately, if enacted, this bill would create significant access and extraction complications for the Navajos. This adverse impact would be a result of the checkerboard nature of the mineral rights and how Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands are intersecting.

Even though the area is proven to house abundant oil and gas reserves, the restrictions on accessing Federal land would make doing business in that area almost impossible, leading to a de facto extraction ban on the Navajo's privately-owned mineral rights. The so-called buffer zone imposed by the bill is arbitrary and completely unnecessary, again, in my opinion.

The whole purpose of establishing the Chaco Culture National Historical Park was to protect every area of historic significance and, again, it has worked for a century now. That goal has already been achieved. The protection is already ensured. Extending the boundaries and adding acreage to the heritage area will not enhance protection of areas of historical significance, but instead, will limit the potential of private landowners to steward and reap the rewards of their privately held land passed down to them from their ancestors.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I strongly oppose this amendment because it would negate the withdrawal. It would prevent us from protecting Chaco Canyon. The gentleman's amendment would allow for new drilling to occur on lands within the withdrawal area, so long as certain standards are met. Essentially, this amendment would protect the status quo, a status quo opposed by the All Pueblo Council of Governors, the Navajo Nation, the entire New Mexico delegation, the governor, and even the administration.

When Secretary Bernhardt visited Chaco last spring, he agreed to a 1-year moratorium because he knew that new drilling posed a threat to these sacred resources. Now this amendment seeks to overturn those temporary protections offered by the Trump administration and to prevent permanent protections from being enacted. That cannot stand.

Furthermore, this amendment contains numerous drafting edits that

would make it impossible to enact. It names the park site incorrectly. It refers to undefined terms. And its unclear wording would essentially allow anyone to drill in the withdrawal area.

This is clearly not a good faith amendment, and it is clearly not an amendment intended to improve this proposal. It is simply an attempt to open these sacred lands with resources that extend beyond the park to extraction, because some of our colleagues cannot be satisfied until every acre of land in this country has an oil rig or an open pit mine.

Ninety percent of this region is already open to leasing. Oil and gas are not under attack in New Mexico. This bill simply attempts to protect an area important to the Tribal communities who have connections to this land that go back thousands of years before this country even existed.

We have to believe, as a House, that some places have value beyond what can be drilled from a hole in the ground. And believe it or not, some things in this world are more important than money. Is there nothing that matters more than industry profits? These are sacred lands, lands that connect us to the past and lands that native communities are asking us to protect. The bones of my ancestors are buried there in its hallowed ground.

We need to listen to the voices of the people whose land it belongs to and who have had it since time immemorial. We need to lift up those voices and we need to protect Chaco Canyon.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Private property rights are a cornerstone of our democracy and our free society. That doesn't just extend to folks in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma. It extends to all Americans and our Tribal brothers and sisters. One of them who testified at one of the hearings, who is a member of the Navajo Nation, said that this is a steadfast personal property right that sustains our livelihoods and our way of life. This is a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, clothe, and protect our families.

Mr. Chairman, this is unnecessary. This is one of those times where Washington thinks it has the solution, where we sit in our ivory tower and dictate the terms to folks living in rural communities in New Mexico and throughout the country, folks that depend on these energy jobs for their livelihoods, and I just trust that the local community and the great State of New Mexico knows best how to manage their resources.

This is not disturbing any sacred land or historic artifacts. That is not what this is about. This is about a protectionist, activist view to ban drilling, in my opinion. And the State of New

Mexico is incredibly dependent on the oil and gas revenues, Mr. Chairman. A third of their budget, Mr. Chairman, is reliant on oil and gas royalties.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it is critical to make sure that our colleagues know that Washington doesn't have the solutions.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I listened closely to the words of my colleague on the other side of the aisle and, Mr. Chairman, he said something that matters very much to me as well: That New Mexico knows best. New Mexico knows best.

The governor of the State of New Mexico, the State land commissioner, the entire delegation supports this legislation. So I am hoping we will earn the vote of my colleague from the other side of the aisle on final adoption, so he can join with the good people of New Mexico and support the bill.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This legislation, H.R. 2181, is absolutely necessary to protect the land of my ancestors and the land of New Mexico. We oppose this amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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 Texas 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 E of House Report 116-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ARRINGTON of Texas.

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

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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—191

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

NOES—233

Adams	Carson (IN)	Craig
Aguilar	Cartwright	Crist
Allred	Case	Crow
Axne	Casten (IL)	Cuellar
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Cunningham
Bass	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Beyer	Cicilline	Davis, Danny K.
Bishop (GA)	Cisneros	Dean
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Bonamici	Clay	DeLauro
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cleaver	DelBene
Brindisi	Clyburn	Delgado
Brown (MD)	Cohen	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Cooper	Deutch
Butterfield	Correa	Dingell
Carbajal	Costa	Doggett
Cárdenas	Courtney	Doyle, Michael F.
	Cox (CA)	

Engel	Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger
Escobar	Lewis	Rush
Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Ryan
Espallat	Lipinski	Sablan
Evans	Loebsack	San Nicolas
Finkenauer	Loftgren	Sánchez
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Fletcher	Lowey	Scanlon
Foster	Luján	Schakowsky
Frankel	Luria	Schiff
Fudge	Lynch	Schneider
Gallego	Malinowski	Schrader
Garamendi	Maloney	Schrier
Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Golden	Matsui	Serrano
Gomez	McBath	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Shalala
Gottheimer	McGovern	Sherman
Green, Al (TX)	McNerney	Sherrill
Grijalva	Meeks	Sires
Haaland	Meng	Slotkin
Harder (CA)	Moore	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Morelle	Soto
Hayes	Moulton	Spanberger
Heck	Mucarsel-Powell	Speier
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Stanton
Himes	Nadler	Stefanik
Horn, Kendra S.	Napolitano	Stevens
Horsford	Neal	Suozi
Houlahan	Neguse	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Norcross	Takano
Huffman	Norton	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Titus
Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Tlaib
Jeffries	Omar	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Panetta	Torres Small
Kaptur	Pappas	(NM)
Katko	Pascrell	Trahan
Keating	Payne	Trone
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Underwood
Khanna	Peters	Van Drew
Kildee	Peterson	Vargas
Kilmer	Phillips	Veasey
Kim	Pingree	Vela
Kind	Plaskett	Velázquez
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Visclosky
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Wasserman
Kuster (NH)	Pressley	Schultz
Lamb	Price (NC)	Waters
Langevin	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Welch
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Wexton
Lawrence	Richmond	Wild
Lawson (FL)	Rose (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lee (CA)	Rouda	Yarmuth
Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard	
Levin (CA)	Ruiz	

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rooney (FL)
Gabbard	Hudson	Rose, John W.
González-Colón	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)
(PR)	McEachin	Timmons
Hice (GA)	Radewagen	

□ 1639

Messrs. PAPPAS, CICILLINE, O'HALLERAN, GOLDEN, SWALWELL of California, and PETERSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina, KELLER, ADERHOLT, and COOK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KILDEE). 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—181

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

NOES—243

Adams	Casten (IL)	Davidson (KS)
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Allred	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny K.
Amash	Chu, Judy	Dean
Axne	Cicilline	DeFazio
Barragán	Cisneros	DeGette
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bera	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Beyer	Clay	Delgado
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Demings
Blumenauer	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Deutch
Bonamici	Cole	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan	Connolly	Doggett
F.	Cook	Doyle, Michael
Brindisi	Cooper	F.
Brown (MD)	Correa	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Escobar
Bustos	Courtney	Eshoo
Butterfield	Cox (CA)	Espallat
Calvert	Craig	Evans
Carbajal	Crist	Finkenauer
Cárdenas	Crow	Fitzpatrick
Carson (IN)	Cuellar	Fletcher
Cartwright	Cunningham	Fortenberry

Foster	Lofgren	Sablan
Frankel	Lowenthal	San Nicolas
Fudge	Lowey	Sánchez
Gallego	Lujan	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Luria	Scanlon
Garcia (IL)	Lynch	Schakowsky
Garcia (TX)	Malinowski	Schiff
Golden	Maloney,	Schneider
Gomez	Carolyn B.	Schrader
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Schrier
Gottheimer	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Green, Al (TX)	McBath	Scott, David
Grijalva	McCollum	Serrano
Haaland	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Shalala
Hastings	Meeks	Sherman
Hayes	Meng	Sherrill
Heck	Moore	Simpson
Herrera Beutler	Morille	Sires
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Slotkin
Himes	Mucarsel-Powell	Smith (NJ)
Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Horsford	Nadler	Soto
Houlahan	Napolitano	Spanberger
Hoyer	Neal	Speier
Huffman	Neguse	Stanton
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Stefanik
Jayapal	Norton	Stevens
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Suozi
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Omar	Takano
Kaptur	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Katko	Pappas	Titus
Keating	Pascarell	Tlaib
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Tonko
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Torres (CA)
Khanna	Peters	Torres Small
Kildee	Peterson	(NM)
Kilmer	Phillips	Trahan
Kim	Pingree	Trone
Kind	Plaskett	Underwood
King (NY)	Pocan	Upton
Kirkpatrick	Porter	Van Drew
Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Vargas
Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lamb	Quigley	Vela
Langevin	Raskin	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Richmond	Wasserman
Lawson (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Schultz
Lee (CA)	Rose (NY)	Waters
Lee (NV)	Rouda	Watson Coleman
Levin (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Levin (MI)	Ruiz	Wexton
Lewis	Ruppersberger	Wild
Lieu, Ted	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Lipinski	Ryan	Yarmuth
Loeb sack		

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty	Hice (GA)	Radewagen
Case	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
González-Colón	Lawrence	Timmons
(PR)	McEachin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1645

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 245, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—181

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

NOES—245

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

Haaland	Maloney, Sean	Shakowsky
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schiff
Hastings	McAdams	Schneider
Hayes	McBath	Schrader
Heck	McCollum	Schrier
Herrera Beutler	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Scott, David
Himes	Meeks	Serrano
Horn, Kendra S.	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Horsford	Moore	Shalala
Houlahan	Morelle	Sherman
Hoyer	Moulton	Sherrill
Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell	Simpson
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Jayapal	Nadler	Slotkin
Jeffries	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Johnson (TX)	Neguse	Soto
Kaptur	Norcross	Spanberger
Katko	Norton	Speier
Keating	O'Halleran	Stanton
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Stefanik
Kennedy	Omar	Stevens
Khanna	Pallone	Suozzi
Kildee	Panetta	Swalwell (CA)
Kilmer	Pappas	Takano
Kim	Pascrell	Takano
Kind	Payne	Thompson (MS)
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Tipton
Kirkpatrick	Peters	Titus
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Tlaib
Kuster (NH)	Phillips	Tonko
Lamb	Pingree	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Plaskett	Torres Small
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	(NM)
Larson (CT)	Porter	Trahan
Lawrence	Pressley	Trone
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Underwood
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Upton
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Van Drew
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Levin (MI)	Richmond	Veasey
Lewis	Rooney (FL)	Vela
Lieu, Ted	Rose (NY)	Velázquez
Lipinski	Rouda	Visclosky
Loebach	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Lofgren	Ruiz	Schultz
Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Waters
Lowey	Rush	Watson Coleman
Luján	Ryan	Welch
Luria	Sablan	Wexton
Lynch	San Nicolas	Wild
Malinowski	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Carolyn B.	Scanlon	

NOT VOTING—11

Beatty	Hice (GA)	Radewagen
Gabbard	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
González-Colón	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
(PR)	McEachin	Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1651

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEYER, 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. 2181) to provide for the withdrawal and protection of certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, and, pursuant to House Resolution 656, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Arrington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2181 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. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not go into effect if the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Governor of New Mexico, determines that the State of New Mexico will suffer a loss of revenue, including revenues used to fund schools, roads, fire and police protection and other public services, attributed to the permanent withdrawal under section 4 of this Act.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of America's economic prosperity and unrivaled security is an abundant, affordable, and reliable supply of domestic energy. American energy independence is, undoubtedly, a matter of national security, but it is also a question of life and death to many rural economies.

In west Texas, and for my neighbors in eastern New Mexico, energy producers are as crucial to our communities as educators, healthcare providers, and agricultural producers. Traditional sources of energy make up 90 percent of our Nation's energy supply and support over 10 million jobs in this great country.

In New Mexico alone, Mr. Speaker, more than 100,000 jobs are oil and gas related. A whopping one-third of the State's budget comes from oil and gas revenues. That is over \$2 billion, half of which supports funding public education.

Thousands of Navajo landowners receive millions of dollars every year from oil and gas royalties. Putting a permanent ban on any future mineral development outside the National Park would be devastating for local economies, the Navajo people, and the entire State of New Mexico.

Therefore, my motion to recommit will prevent this legislation from taking effect until it is confirmed that New Mexico will not suffer this severe economic harm resulting in a loss of revenue. That is revenue used to fund schools, roads, hospitals, and other important public services.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill claims not to infringe on the private property rights of the Navajo people, the reality is that many of their lands are surrounded by Federal lands, making it virtually impossible to develop if this legislation were to pass.

H.R. 2181, let's be clear, would eliminate key revenue sources used for public services. It would destroy jobs and economic activity there in New Mexico and, ultimately, threaten the livelihood of the Navajo people.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would be an absolute travesty for the Navajo people because the poverty rate in the Navajo Nation is more than three times the national average, about 38 percent. The unemployment rate is more than five times the national average, 20-plus percent. Almost half of all Navajo children live in poverty.

Oil- and gas-related employment is critical to jobs and income in these isolated areas where the Navajo people live. It is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, that a handful of activists should be able to deprive the Navajo Nation of opportunities to find work, opportunities to lease their own mineral rights, and opportunities to lift themselves up out of poverty by reaping the benefits of their own land.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old Navajo saying: "A rocky vineyard does not need a prayer, but a pickax."

The Navajo people don't need more protectionists' prayers from Washington elite and environmental activists. They need the pickax of prosperity and opportunity that comes from freedom, and the ability to manage their own private property rights and their own private mineral rights.

The Navajo people are a proud people, just like all Americans, and they just want an opportunity for a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, this is a classic case of a solution looking for a problem. I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and vote "no" on H.R. 2181.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is just another attempt to distract from the importance of this proposal, which is listening to Tribal voices by protecting the sacred sites of Chaco Canyon from oil and gas extraction.

The bill would not impact New Mexico revenue streams in the slightest. The State has already withdrawn State lands in Chaco and opted to protect our indigenous lands, because they also recognize the value of our outdoor economy which requires a clean environment.

The bill would not impact the New Mexico revenue streams in the slightest. This country is the largest producer of oil and gas in the world. We produce over 12 million barrels of crude oil a day, sending 3 million of those to other countries.

Lack of access to oil and gas is not an issue in New Mexico, and this bill will in no way hinder the tremendous amount of energy extraction in the State. Between 2010 and 2018, oil production in New Mexico increased by nearly 400 percent, and the State is now the third largest producer in the Nation after Texas and North Dakota.

In the San Juan Basin where Chaco Canyon is located, 90 percent of public land is already open to development.

Must every inch of land be swallowed by oil and gas-sucking machinery?

Thousands of sacred ancestral sites to the Pueblo people are sites where Indians are under threat unless we act. Tribes across New Mexico and this country have asked this body to protect Chaco Canyon. We shouldn't put the sacred sites of Chaco Canyon and our environment at risk on the impossible theory that we can become energy dominant or that we need to open every single acre to oil and gas development regardless of how special that land is.

If we really want to lead in energy, we should take a larger role in renewable energy and low-carbon energy sources, and New Mexico can lead the way with our 300 days of sun per year and our abundance of wind.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration prioritizes fossil fuels and believes the future lies in coal, oil, and gas. But the President is wrong, and Republicans are wrong. The world's power sources are changing, and no one stands to benefit more from U.S. leadership during this transition than American consumers.

The only question that remains is whether this body will help lead our Nation in implementing a modern, clean energy agenda or whether we will remain stuck in the past, holding on to the 1950s like there is no future to believe in.

Now is not the time to open our protected public lands up to unnecessary oil and gas extraction. Now is the time to protect these important places and to lift up the voices of communities on the ground.

Some things are more important than money, and my ancestral homeland most definitely is.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and support this bill that would protect the sacred lands in New Mexico and that is Chaco Canyon.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was 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—ayes 199, noes 222, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

AYES—199

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

NOES—222

Adams	Bass	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Amash	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Axne	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Barragán	Blunt Rochester	Bustos

Butterfield	Horsford	Perlmutter
Carbajal	Houlahan	Peters
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Peterson
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Phillips
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Case	Jayapal	Pocan
Casten (IL)	Jeffries	Porter
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Pressley
Castro (TX)	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Quigley
Cicilline	Keating	Raskin
Cisneros	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Rose (NY)
Clay	Kildee	Rouda
Cleaver	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kim	Ruiz
Cohen	Kind	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Courtney	Lamb	Sarbanes
Cox (CA)	Langevin	Scanlon
Craig	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Crow	Lawrence	Schneider
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Serrano
Dean	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Shalala
DeGette	Lipinski	Sherman
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Sherrill
DelBene	Lofgren	Sires
Delgado	Lowenthal	Slotkin
Demings	Lowey	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lujan	Soto
Deutch	Luria	Speier
Dingell	Lynch	Stanton
Doggett	Malinowski	Stevens
Doyle, Michael	Maloney	Suoizzi
F.	Carolyn B.	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Escobar	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Espallat	McBath	Titus
Evans	McCollum	Tlaib
Finkenauer	McGovern	Tonko
Fletcher	McNerney	Torres (CA)
Foster	Meeks	Trahan
Frankel	Meng	Trone
Fudge	Moore	Underwood
Galleo	Morelle	Van Drew
Garamendi	Moulton	Vargas
Garcia (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Veasey
Garcia (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Gomez	Nadler	Velázquez
Gonzalez (TX)	Napolitano	Visclosky
Gottheimer	Neal	Wasserman
Green, Al (TX)	Neguse	Schultz
Grijalva	Norcross	Waters
Haaland	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Harder (CA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Welch
Hastings	Omar	Wexton
Hayes	Pallone	Wild
Heck	Panetta	Wilson (FL)
Higgins (NY)	Pappas	Yarmuth
Himes	Pascrell	
Horn, Kendra S.	Payne	

NOT VOTING—10

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Eshoo	Hudson	Timmons
Gabbard	McEachin	
Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1710

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 174, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—245

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

NAYS—174

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Armstrong

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

NOT VOTING—12

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rooney (FL)
Curtis	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	McEachin	Thompson (CA)
Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1717

Mr. WILLIAMS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. REED changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 656 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1373.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1719

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, with Mr. KILDEE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 116-264 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 116-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 240, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

AYES—185

Abraham	Buchanan	Curtis
Aderholt	Buck	Davidson (OH)
Allen	Bucshon	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Budd	DesJarlais
Armstrong	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Burgess	Duncan
Babin	Byrne	Dunn
Bacon	Calvert	Emmer
Baird	Carter (GA)	Estes
Balderson	Carter (TX)	Ferguson
Banks	Chabot	Fleischmann
Barr	Cheney	Flores
Bergman	Cline	Fortenberry
Biggs	Cloud	Foxx (NC)
Bilirakis	Cole	Fulcher
Bishop (NC)	Collins (GA)	Gaetz
Bishop (UT)	Comer	Gallagher
Bost	Conaway	Gianforte
Brady	Cook	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Gohmert
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Gonzalez (OH)