United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 7, 2015 No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ABRAHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 7, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RALPH LEE ABRAHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of this assembly return from days away celebrating our Nation's birth, grant them safe journey. May they return ready to assume a difficult work which must be done.

We pray for the needs of the Nation, the world, and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service.

May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our people.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

U.S. SOCCER TEAM WINS WORLD CUP

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 2011, the United States Women's soccer team lost to Japan in the World Cup title match. It was a crushing defeat, one that motivated the Women's National Team.

The World Cup is every 4 years, and the rematch this Sunday was one for the history books. Scoring the most goals in any World Cup final game, the United States Women's National Team earned their third World Cup championship. That is unprecedented.

Just 16 minutes into the game, the U.S. center midfielder scored her third goal of the game. It was the hat trick seen around the world.

The roar of the announcers echoed in living rooms across America. Twenty-five million people cheered on the USA, and a new American hero, Carli Lloyd, became a household name.

The United States defeated Japan 5–2, as the Red, White, and Blue proudly waved over the field in Vancouver, Canada.

Congratulations to the 2015 Women's National Team and to Coach Jill Ellis. The team motto, ''She Believes,'' made believers of the whole world.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the names of all of the players, their hometowns, and their jersey numbers into the RECORD.

2015 US WOMEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

Shannon Box—Redondo Beach, CA—7; Morgan Brian—St. Simons Island, GA—14; Lori Chalupny—St. Louis, MO—16; Whitney Engen—Rolling Hills Estates, CA—6; Ashlyn Harris—Satellite Beach, FL—18; Tobin Heath—Basking Ridge, NJ—17; Lauren Holiday—Indianapolis, IN—12; Julie Johnston—Mesa, AZ—19; Meghan Klingenberg—Gibsonia, PA—22; Ali Krieger—Dumfries, VA—11; Sydney Leroux—Scottsdale, AZ—2; Carli Lloyd—Delran, NJ—10; Alex Morgan—Diamond Bar, CA—13; Alyssa Naeher—Bridgepoint, CT—21; Kelley O'Hara—Fayetteville, GA—5; Heather O'Reilly—East Brunswick, NJ—9; Christen Press—Palos Verdes Estates, CA—23; Christie Rampone—Point Pleasant, NJ—3; Megan Rapinoe—Redding, CA—15; Amy Rodriguez—Lake Forest, CA—8; Becky Sauerbrunn—St. Louis, MO—4; Hope Solo—Richland, WA—1; Abby Wambach—Rochester, NY—20.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT TRUST FUND EXPIRES

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, the highway and transit trust fund will expire, which would be devastating to our country's competitiveness and threaten 660,000 American jobs and thousands of projects to rebuild America's roads, rails, and bridges. We can't let this happen, not during the middle of the summer construction season for sure.

That is why Congress, Democrats and Republicans, really have to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass a plan to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, our roads, our rails, and our bridges.

Right now, as a percentage of GDP, China is spending 10 times what we are

Printed on recycled paper.

on infrastructure. They are investing in their future.

Meanwhile, here at home, we can't even act to extend the highway trust fund, let alone adopt a 21st century plan that invests in our future, invests in America, and rebuilds this Nation in a way that puts people to work and makes us more competitive. How are we supposed to compete with China if we can't even rebuild our own roads and bridges?

We need to act together. Mr. Speaker, the time has long passed. Let's act today.

APPRECIATING THE FLYING TIGERS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to recognize the Flying Tigers, a courageous group of volunteer pilots of World War II who carried out strategic air support missions to protect the citizens of the Republic of China. This elite group became the 14th Air Force and included my father, First Lieutenant Hugh de Veaux Wilson.

Through the leadership of General Claire Chennault, the Flying Tigers achieved impressive victories, destroying 296 enemy aircraft, stopping the invaders, and saving millions of Chinese lives.

America is always appreciative to the Republic of China military who rescued most of the crews after 15 U.S. planes crashed into China following the Doolittle Raid in 1942. This raid was formed in my hometown of Springdale at Columbia Army Air Base in South Carolina.

I have visited President Jiang Zemin at the Presidential compound in Beijing on a delegation led by Congressman Curt Weldon. Upon hearing of my father's Flying Tiger service, President Jiang Zemin interrupted the meeting to announce his view that, because of the Flying Tigers, ''the American military is revered in China.''

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter the following words into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

''No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family. In forming a marital union, two people become something greater than once they were.

''As some of the petitioners in these cases demonstrate, marriage embodies a love that may endure even past death. It would misunderstand these men and women to say they disrespect the idea of marriage.

''Their plea is that they do respect it, respect it so deeply that they seek to find its fulfillment for themselves. Their hope is not to be condemned to live in loneliness, excluded from one of civilization's oldest institutions.

''They ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The Constitution grants them that right. The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is reversed.

''It is so ordered.''

These words, Mr. Speaker, were written by Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy in his Obergefell v. Hodges ruling, and they embody what the LGBT community has pursued for decades: equality under the law.

HONORING MINNESOTA'S PHIL HOUSLEY

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend and Minnesota's own, Phil Housley, on his recent induction into the Hockey Hall of Fame.

Phil Housley is a true Minnesotan. Born and raised in the state of hockey, he graduated from South St. Paul High School in 1982.

Phil was drafted by the Buffalo Sabres right out of high school and spent 21 years playing in the National Hockey League for eight different teams.

Phil is a seven-time all-star and the highest scoring U.S.-born defenseman in NHL history. He also helped Team USA win a silver medal in the 2002 Olympics.

Phil played his last professional game in 2003, but his hockey career did not end there. He is currently working as the assistant coach for the Nashville Predators.

Phil was born to compete at the highest level, and he is being recognized with the highest honor his sport can grant: induction into the Hockey Hall of Fame.

Congratulations, Phil. You deserve it.

FAMILIES IMPACTED BY OPIATE ABUSE

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spent part of my day with a number of families from Taunton, Massachusetts, a city in my district that has been tragically impacted by opiate abuse.

Of the families that were there, one young man stood out. Cory was an honor student from Taunton High School. He was a starting pitcher for the baseball team when a pitching injury sidelined him and forced him into surgery. After 12 bouts in rehab, he ended up overdosing on heroin and today continues to suffer brain damage from that overdose.

Mr. Speaker, these stories have become far too common, not just across Taunton and across our Commonwealth in Massachusetts, but around our country.

This is why I rise today to recognize the tremendous work of my colleague, Congressman WHITFIELD, and his work in introducing with me the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act, as well as our colleague Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS, who has introduced the Heroin and Prescription Opioid Abuse Prevention, Education, and Enforcement Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is no silver bullet to these challenges. Together, this body, piece by piece, can help craft the legislation that we need to get this epidemic under wraps.

SANCTUARY CITIES COST INNOCENT LIVES

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, dangerous policies have deadly consequences. We were reminded of this last week when a young woman in San Francisco, Kate Steinle, was tragically murdered by an illegal immigrant who should have been deported long ago.

Unknown to many Americans, cities across the Nation, like San Francisco, have declared that they will be a sanctuary for illegal immigrants. They refuse to cooperate with Federal immigration authorities in violation of Federal law. And victims like Kate Steinle pay the ultimate price

This administration, regrettably, has condoned sanctuary cities and has done nothing to make them abide by Federal immigration laws.

In this case, the killer had been ordered deported five times and charged with seven previous felonies but had been released instead.

If this administration and local officials in sanctuary cities care about the safety of the American people, they should work to secure our borders and uphold, not undermine, our immigration laws.

JORDAN DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

(Ms. GRANGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the United States Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, I rise in strong support of this bill.

Jordan is a vital and loyal partner in the Middle East. Under King Abdullah's strong leadership, Jordan

continues to play a critical role in advancing peace and stability in the region and in the ongoing campaign to defeat ISIL.

Jordan is a leader in the fight against Islamic extremism, conducting airstrikes, training partner nations and rebel forces, and supplying allies.

Due to the unrest in the region and the hosting of more than 700,000 Syrian refugees, Jordan's economy faces ongoing economic and security needs.

As chairwoman of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Subcommittee, I fought to ensure that the Jordanians have the support they need to address these many challenges.

The United States must continue to provide assistance Jordan needs to ensure its success in coalition operations, including strengthening the borders with Iraq and Syria. It is important for both their security and ours.

This support is a key component of the U.S. efforts to keep terrorism in check, create stability in the Middle East, and protect the American people. This assistance should not be delayed because of unnecessary bureaucracy. Such a valued partner deserves and needs our assistance immediately.

This resolution allows Jordan to be treated as if it were a member of the NATO-plus group of countries, which makes them eligible to receive special treatment for the transfer of U.S. defense articles and services.

This important bill must be enacted. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

□ 1415

LONG-TERM INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress must come up with a long-term infrastructure plan, and it must do it this month before the highway trust fund expires.

No great country can stay great without investing in its infrastructure. Throughout history, great leaders of both parties have understood there is a return on that investment. George Washington understood the need for internal improvements; so did Henry Clay. In the middle of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln and this Congress invested in the transcontinental railroad.

They had the vision to understand we were making decisions for future generations, and if we don't, China, India, Japan, and our competitors will. They are making the decisions we are not making. They are advancing while we are retreating in critical infrastructure investment.

The American people deserve better from this Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bills were signed by Speaker pro tempore THORNBERRY on Friday, June 26, 2015:

H.R. 893, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

UNITED STATES-JORDAN DEFENSE COOPERATION ACT OF 2015

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 907) to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 907

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 ''United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) As of January 22, 2015, the United States Government has provided $3,046,343,000 in assistance to the Syria humanitarian response, of which nearly $467,000,000 has been to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

(2) As of January 2015, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), there are 621,937 registered Syrian refugees in Jordan and 83.8 percent of those refugees live outside refugee camps.

(3) In 2000, the United States and Jordan signed a free-trade agreement that went into force in 2001.

(4) In 1996, the United States granted Jordan major non-NATO ally status.

(5) Jordan is suffering from the Syrian refugee crisis and the threat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(6) The Government of Jordan was elected as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council beginning in January 2014 and terminating in December 2015.

(7) Enhanced support for defense cooperation with Jordan is important to the national security of the United States, including through creation of a status in law for Jordan similar to the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Australia, the Republic of Korea, Israel, and New Zealand, with respect to consideration by Congress of foreign military sales to Jordan.

(8) The Colorado National Guard's relationship with the Jordanian military provides a significant benefit to both the United States and Jordan.

(9) Jordanian pilot Moaz al-Kasasbeh was brutally murdered by ISIL.

(10) On February 3, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry and Jordanian Foreign Minister Nasser Judeh signed a new Memorandum of Understanding that reflects the intention to increase United States assistance to the Government of Jordan from $660,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 per year for the years 2015 through 2017.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It should be the policy of the United States to support the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in its response to the Syrian refugee crisis, provide necessary assistance to alleviate the domestic burden to provide basic needs for the assimilated Syrian refugees, cooperate with Jordan to combat the terrorist threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) or other terrorist organizations, and help secure the border between Jordan and its neighbors Syria and Iraq.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that expeditious consideration of certifications of letters of offer to sell defense articles, defense services, design and construction services, and major defense equipment to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) is fully consistent with United States security and foreign policy interests and the objectives of world peace and security.

SEC. 5. ENHANCED DEFENSE COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan shall be treated as if it were a country listed in the provisions of law described in subsection (b) for purposes of applying and administering such provisions of law.

(b) PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of law described in this subsection are the following provisions of the Arms Export Control Act:

(1) Subsections (b)(2), (d)(2)(B), (d)(3)(A)(i), and (d)(5) of section 3 (22 U.S.C. 2753).

(2) Subsections (e)(2)(A), (h)(1)(A), (h)(2) of section 21 (22 U.S.C. 2761).

(3) Subsections (b)(1), (b)(2), (b)(6), (c), and (d)(2)(A) of section 36 (22 U.S.C. 2776).

(4) Section 62(c)(1) (22 U.S.C. 2796a(c)(1)).

(5) Section 63(a)(2) (22 U.S.C. 2796b(a)(2)).

SEC. 6. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.

The Secretary of State is authorized, subject to the availability of appropriations, to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to increase economic support funds, military cooperation, including joint military exercises, personnel exchanges, support for international peacekeeping missions, and enhanced strategic dialogue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements or extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 907, which is before us, is a simple, straightforward, commonsense bill that not only helps secure U.S. national security interests, but also the security interests of one of our closest allies in the Middle East, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

This bill will give Jordan the ability to buy defense articles, defense services, and major defense equipment under the Arms Export Control Act, as long as any sale is fully consistent with United States security and foreign policy interests and objectives.

The bill also supports the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in its response to the Syrian refugee crisis to help alleviate the domestic burden to provide basic needs for the assimilated Syrian refugees, and the bill also calls for greater cooperation with Jordan to fight the terrorist threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant—ISIL—or any other terrorist organization.

Late last year, Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill after leading a congressional delegation to Jordan. We traveled to Jordan to see how the people of Jordan were dealing with the strains put on them from the humanitarian crisis developing in Syria.

The King of Jordan had taken in somewhere in the neighborhood of 1 million refugees, despite the toll it has taken on his country's infrastructure and resources; but despite the added pressures the Kingdom was facing from the refugee crisis, the King told us that one of the most pressing issues he was facing was the encroachment of ISIL toward his borders.

He stressed that he was willing to help lead the fight against ISIL, but he just did not have sufficient military equipment with which to do so.

I understand how important the stability and security of Jordan is not just for the region, but also for another strong ally of ours, the democratic Jewish State of Israel. It made sense that, in order to maintain the fragile stability in some of the countries in the region, we would need to help bolster the capabilities of our friends who are committed to defeating this radical extremist threat.

We marked up the bill in November of last year, but simply ran out of time at the end of the Congress. I reintroduced the bill again this year, alongside Mr. TED DEUTCH of Florida, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee; KAY GRANGER, chairman of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Subcommittee; and NITA LOWEY, ranking member of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Subcommittee.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL because it is through their leadership that we were able to pass the bill out of the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously this past April.

Mr. Speaker, in Jordan, the U.S. could not ask for a more committed partner in the fight against ISIL. King Abdullah is committed to that fight. He understands the urgency and need to address ISIL head on, and he has shown that he is willing to take the necessary measures to defeat these extremists, but he needs more resources to fight ISIL. He needs these resources to protect the security of his people.

Congress must do everything that we can to help our friends defend themselves and defeat this scourge of terror. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 907, the U.S.-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015. As the Middle East has become more unstable and as ISIS continues to terrorize the people of Syria, Iraq, and its neighbors, Jordan remains resolute. While ISIS threatens its borders and terrorizes its people, Jordan has fought back.

When Jordan Air Force pilot Captain al-Kasasbeh was brutally murdered—burned alive in a cage, Mr. Speaker—Jordan did not shrink; it did not retreat. Instead, it took even a more active role in airstrikes against the ISIS threat.

The Syrian civil war and instability created by ISIS has placed a tremendous pressure on the country of Jordan. Jordan has absorbed 620,000 Syrian refugees during this crisis. Its healthcare and educational systems are under severe strain as a result.

The United States has provided over $460 million in response, on top of the over $1 billion in bilateral foreign assistance Jordan received last year. In February, the U.S. and Jordanian Governments signed a memorandum of understanding outlining the intention to provide Jordan with $1 billion per year for the next 3 years. This agreement and this legislation seek to ensure that Jordan is able to defend itself in the wake of these severe threats.

For the next 3 years, the bill would treat Jordan as a NATO member in how weapons sales and maintenance, manufacturing licensing agreements, and technical assistance are considered and notified to this Congress. The bill also authorizes a MOU with Jordan to increase economic and military assistance, as well as joint military operations.

The U.S.-Jordanian relationship is mutually beneficial. Now, more than ever, Jordan needs U.S. support. We need strong Jordanian resolve in the face of the threat against ISIS. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, let me close by noting that this bill is crucial because it shows that, if given proper assistance, the region can stand up for itself. This measure does not put U.S. boots on the ground. U.S. support and leadership is appreciated, of course, but Jordan is seeking to defend itself with our help.

We have had many solemn conversations in this body and on this floor about issues of war and peace. This bill demonstrates U.S. leadership in preparing others to fight their own battles, and that is an important strategy as we move forward. This legislation is consistent with that principle.

I urge my colleagues to give this their full support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for his comments. I know that it comes from great experience. I believe that he also served as a staff member on the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. That has definitely helped him form his opinions and expertise.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am just amazed that my friend from Florida would be in possession of such intricate knowledge. I thank her for acknowledging it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Reclaiming my time, this bill could not come at a more important time, Mr. Speaker.

In March, I was honored to join Speaker BOEHNER on a congressional trip to Jordan in order to discuss the growing threat to that region. I had previously gone there on my own CODEL. Now, going back in March, I see how ISIL has created an even greater threat to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the refugee crisis continues to build up for the Kingdom of Jordan.

We expressed our appreciation to His Majesty for his steadfast commitment, to support his efforts to fight this ISIL threat, and help him with the burden of the refugees.

The King reiterated again his commitment to defeating ISIL and the need for more assistance from the international community. We told him that we would do what we could to ensure that he had all of the tools needed to win this fight against ISIL.

Since the coalition campaign against ISIL began, Mr. Speaker, the terror group has made great gains in Iraq and Syria. It has expanded its influence across the globe to places like Libya, Tunisia, Sinai, Europe, and even here in the United States.

Congress needs to do our part. We need to step up. We need to show our allies that we are committed to help them. They are taking the fight to ISIL. Let's help them with these tools. We need to show ISIL and all of our enemies that we will stand by our allies.

We will stand by our friends and help them do what is necessary—all that is necessary—to defeat terror and to defeat radical extremism.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital, important bill and support our key ally, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. I would like to thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL again for their leadership, as well as Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. GRANGER, and Mrs. LOWEY.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 907, U.S.-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015.

The United States has no stronger partner in the Arab world than Jordan, and His Majesty King Abdullah II continues to be a pioneer in bolstering moderate political voices both in Jordan and throughout the Muslim world.

During such a tumultuous time in the region, with the rise of ISIL and the unprecedented humanitarian needs of millions of refugees, stability and security in Jordan remain vital to our own interests.

That is why this legislation is so important. It would help strengthen military and economic ties between our two countries.

As the Ranking Member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, I remain committed to our strategic partnership with Jordan, and I will continue to work as hard as possible to promote stability, economic growth, and prosperity for the Jordanian people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 907, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN'S I.D. CARD ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 91) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Veterans Identification Card Act 2015''.

SEC. 2. VETERANS IDENTIFICATION CARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, veteran identification cards were issued to veterans who have either completed the statutory time-in-service requirement for retirement from the Armed Forces or who have received a medical-related discharge from the Armed Forces.

(2) Effective on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, a veteran who served a minimum obligated time in service, but who did not meet the criteria described in paragraph (1), did not receive a means of identifying the veteran's status as a veteran other than using the Department of Defense form DD–214 discharge papers of the veteran.

(3) Goods, services, and promotional activities are often offered by public and private institutions to veterans who demonstrate proof of service in the military, but it is impractical for a veteran to always carry Department of Defense form DD–214 discharge papers to demonstrate such proof.

(4) A general purpose veteran identification card made available to veterans would be useful to demonstrate the status of the veterans without having to carry and use official Department of Defense form DD–214 discharge papers.

(5) On the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Department of Veterans Affairs had the infrastructure in place across the United States to produce photographic identification cards and accept a small payment to cover the cost of these cards.

(b) PROVISION OF VETERAN IDENTIFICATION CARDS.—Chapter 57 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5705 the following new section:

''§ 5706. Veterans identification card

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall issue an identification card described in subsection (b) to each veteran who—

''(1) requests such card;

''(2) presents a copy of Department of Defense form DD–214 or other official document from the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran; and

''(3) pays the fee under subsection (c)(1).

''(b) IDENTIFICATION CARD.—An identification card described in this subsection is a card issued to a veteran that—

''(1) displays a photograph of the veteran;

''(2) displays the name of the veteran;

''(3) explains that such card is not proof of any benefits to which the veteran is entitled to;

''(4) contains an identification number that is not a social security number; and

''(5) serves as proof that such veteran—

''(A) served in the Armed Forces; and

''(B) has a Department of Defense form DD–214 or other official document in the official military personnel file of the veteran that describes the service of the veteran.

''(c) COSTS OF CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall charge a fee to each veteran who receives an identification card issued under this section, including a replacement identification card.

''(2)(A) The fee charged under paragraph (1) shall equal such amount as the Secretary determines is necessary to issue an identification card under this section.

''(B) In determining the amount of the fee under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ensure that the total amount of fees collected under paragraph (1) equals an amount necessary to carry out this section, including costs related to any additional equipment or personnel required to carry out this section.

''(C) The Secretary shall review and reassess the determination under subparagraph (A) during each five-year period in which the Secretary issues an identification card under this section.

''(3) Amounts collected under this subsection shall be deposited in an account of the Department available to carry out this section. Amounts so deposited shall be—

''(A) merged with amounts in such account;

''(B) available in such amounts as may be provided in appropriation Acts; and

''(C) subject to the same conditions and limitations as amounts otherwise in such account.

''(d) EFFECT OF CARD ON BENEFITS.—(1) An identification card issued under this section shall not serve as proof of any benefits that the veteran may be entitled to under this title.

''(2) A veteran who is issued an identification card under this section shall not be entitled to any benefits under this title by reason of possessing such card.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that any information collected or used with respect to an identification card issued under this section is appropriately secured.

''(2) The Secretary may determine any appropriate procedures with respect to issuing a replacement identification card.

''(3) In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the National Personnel Records Center.

''(4) The Secretary may conduct such outreach to advertise the identification card under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—This section shall not be construed to affect identification cards otherwise provided by the Secretary to veterans enrolled in the health care system established under section 1705(a) of this title.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5705 the following new item:

''5706. Veterans identification card.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on the Senate amendment to H.R. 91.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, many businesses show their gratitude to our Nation's servicemembers and veterans by offering special discounts on goods and services to those who have served our Nation in uniform.

Unfortunately, unless a servicemember is a qualified military retiree, DOD does not issue an official ID card as proof of service. That means that millions of veterans cannot easily provide evidence of their service.

This bill, as amended, would change that by directing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue a veteran's ID card that would display the veteran's name and photograph to any veteran who requests such a card, as long as the veteran is not entitled to military retired pay, nor enrolled in the VA healthcare system.

This card would give those who served in the Armed Forces a convenient way to prove that they are veterans, for the purpose of receiving the

promotions and discounts offered by many businesses around the country.

The bill, as amended, would also require the Secretary to determine a fee to be charged that would cover all costs of producing the cards and managing the program. The bill also specifies that the card does not entitle the holder to any VA benefits.

H.R. 91 passed the House by a vote of 402–0 on May 18. The Senate passed it by unanimous consent on June 22, with an amendment that would authorize VA to provide this card to any person who meets the statutory definition of a veteran.

Under current law, a veteran is defined as ''a person who served in the active military, naval, or air service and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.''

I thank my colleague Mr. BUCHANAN for his efforts on this commonsense legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 91 passed the House 402–0, as my good friend mentioned, in May. It was amended by the Senate and passed 2 weeks ago. Today, we are taking up the Senate amendment to H.R. 91. This measure will assist veterans in proving that they are indeed veterans.

In most instances, a veteran must be enrolled with the VA to receive a VA ID card or utilize their DD–214 to prove their military service, which may contain personal health information.

Veterans who retire from the armed services are issued a Department of Defense ID card that serves this purpose. However, the majority of servicemembers do not retire in service, leaving millions of veterans sometimes challenged to provide proof of their honorable military service.

Extending the option of a veterans ID is a simple way to resolve this issue and honor America's veterans.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today is a good day for our Nation's veterans.

My legislation will allow all veterans to receive official ID cards through the VA. No longer will veterans be forced to carry around documents that contain sensitive information that puts them at needless risk of identity theft, and it does all this at no cost to the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a prime example of what can be accomplished when we put partisanship aside and the needs of our country first.

Thank you, and God bless our men and women in uniform.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I join Vietnam Veterans of America, the Association of the U.S. Navy, American Veterans, and others in wholehearted support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 91, the Veterans I.D. Card Act of 2015.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, once again, I encourage all Members to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 91, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 91.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LAND MANAGEMENT WORKFORCE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1531) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1531

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 ''Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act''.

SEC. 2. PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITIES RELATING TO LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart I of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 95 the following:

''CHAPTER 96—PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITIES RELATING TO LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES

''Sec.
''9601. Definitions.
''9602. Competitive service; time-limited appointments.

''§ 9601. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'land management agency' means—

''(A) the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture;

''(B) the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior;

''(C) the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior;

''(D) the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior;

''(E) the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior; and

''(F) the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior; and

''(2) the term 'time-limited appointment' includes a temporary appointment and a term appointment, as defined by the Office of Personnel Management.

''§ 9602. Competitive service; time-limited appointments

''(a) Notwithstanding chapter 33 or any other provision of law relating to the examination, certification, and appointment of individuals in the competitive service, an employee of a land management agency serving under a time-limited appointment in the competitive service is eligible to compete for a permanent appointment in the competitive service at any land management agency or any other agency (as defined in section 101 of title 31) under the internal merit promotion procedures of the applicable agency if—

''(1) the employee was appointed initially under open, competitive examination under subchapter I of chapter 33 to the time-limited appointment;

''(2) the employee has served under 1 or more time-limited appointments by a land management agency for a period or periods totaling more than 24 months without a break of 2 or more years; and

''(3) the employee's performance has been at an acceptable level of performance throughout the period or periods (as the case may be) referred to in paragraph (2).

''(b) In determining the eligibility of a time-limited employee under this section to be examined for or appointed in the competitive service, the Office of Personnel Management or other examining agency shall waive requirements as to age, unless the requirement is essential to the performance of the duties of the position.

''(c) An individual appointed under this section—

''(1) becomes a career-conditional employee, unless the employee has otherwise completed the service requirements for career tenure; and

''(2) acquires competitive status upon appointment.

''(d) A former employee of a land management agency who served under a time-limited appointment and who otherwise meets the requirements of this section shall be deemed a time-limited employee for purposes of this section if—

''(1) such employee applies for a position covered by this section within the period of 2 years after the most recent date of separation; and

''(2) such employee's most recent separation was for reasons other than misconduct or performance.

''(e) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item for chapter 95 the following:

''96. Personnel flexibilities relating to land management agencies ..... 9601''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1531, introduced by our colleague from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). The Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act allows certain temporary workers to compete for full-time positions when vacancies arise.

Many of the Federal Government's firefighters work on a temporary basis and gain valuable experience as they return year after year to battle Western wildfires. Current law prevents these experienced employees from competing for full-time jobs under internal merit promotion procedures.

This commonsense bill will allow Federal land agencies to fully consider the applications of experienced workers when they identify the need for a full-time employee.

Covered agencies include the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The bill does not change the total number of Federal jobs available or the salaries paid to Federal employees; rather, it expands the pool of individuals eligible for Federal land management positions.

Of course, the bill does impose a few conditions to be eligible to compete for a full-time position, including length of service and adherence to performance standards.

I urge support for this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for being here today on the floor.

Madam Speaker, obviously, I rise in strong support of our bipartisan Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act. I want to take a moment to recognize our colleagues, Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska and Congressman ROB BISHOP of Utah, two of this Chamber's most dedicated advocates for the men and women who comprise America's hard-working temporary civil service, particularly our Nation's courageous temporary seasonal wildland firefighters.

It was an honor to join my esteemed colleagues, who have each served as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, to develop and introduce this good government legislation. The spirit of bipartisanship that went into creating it is reflected in the equal number of Democratic and Republican cosponsors.

Further, I was pleased that the entire Committee on Oversight and Government Reform joined us in unanimously supporting this much-needed reform to remove arbitrary barriers that prevent talented, long-term temporary seasonal employees from just competing for vacant permanent positions, as my friend from Georgia described.

As the committee noted favorably in reporting the bill, our legislation will improve government effectiveness by enhancing the quality of the pool of applicants for Federal positions.

Our commonsense legislation provides long-serving, temporary seasonal wildland firefighters and other seasonal employees with the same career advancement opportunities available to all other Federal employees.

Specifically, the Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act authorizes qualifying land management agency employees serving under time-limited appointments to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, just as any permanent Federal employee is eligible to do.

Our bill is deficit neutral, as my friend from Georgia indicated, because it only strengthens the pool of individuals eligible to compete for vacant Federal permanent positions. It does not create new positions.

As the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office noted, ''CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would have no significant effect on the Federal budget. Enacting the bill would not affect direct spending or revenues because our bipartisan bill would,'' to quote CBO, ''not change the total number of Federal jobs available.''

As many of my colleagues understand, particularly those Members who represent Western constituencies in America, many Federal land management employees, including wildland firefighters, are often hired under temporary appointments that amount to less than 6 months or 1,040 hours. These individuals, so often called temporary appointments, repeatedly are extended on an annual basis.

As Congressman STEPHEN LYNCH, my friend from Massachusetts, the former chairman of the Federal Workforce Subcommittee, observed at a 2010 hearing: ''Oftentimes, seasonal temporary employees have worked in the same capacity year after year, decade after decade.''

Despite those years of service and putting themselves often in harm's way, career advancement and opportunities are severely limited. It is difficult to overstate the adverse impact the unfair policy of precluding their ability to compete for the same jobs as full-time Federal employees has on Americans serving under term-limited appointments since many agencies utilize merit promotion to competitively fill nonentry-level jobs.

Indeed, bipartisan concerns have been raised over a status quo where, no matter how long an individual may serve under a term-limited appointment, even one that is originally obtained under open, competitive examination, he or she never can acquire the status that would enable him or her to compete for vacant permanent positions.

For example, a former chairman of the House Civil Service Subcommittee addressed the illogical inequity of this position at a 1993 hearing, stating:

> Furthermore, there needs to be better access for all temporary employees, not just term employees, to apply for permanent positions within the Federal Government. It is simply unfair that, after years of employment, a temporary employee applying for a permanent position job is no better off than someone off the street applying for a job. Agencies could save large sums of money on education and training by hiring more temporary employees for permanent positions.

At the same hearing, former Congressman Dan Burton submitted a statement for the RECORD, expressing the view: ''One of the best things we can do for temporary employees is to increase their opportunities to compete for permanent positions.''

The current barrier to competition placed on our Nation's temporary seasonal employees demoralizes the dedicated and courageous corps of temporary civil servants that serve in land management agencies, and it contributes to increased attrition and, ultimately, leads to higher training costs and a less-experienced and capable workforce.

As the devastating 2014 California wildfires demonstrated, our country cannot afford to degrade its wildland firefighting and emergency response capabilities that put themselves in harm's way. Our bipartisan bill is consistent with the Office of Personnel Management's support for the concept.

In closing, I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan Land Management Workforce Flexibility Act.

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

□ 1445

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1531.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to

include extraneous material on H.R. 2822 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 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. 2822.

Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1446

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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 25, 2015, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 76, line 4.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I would encourage Members who have striking amendments to come to the floor immediately.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, $357,363,000, to remain available until expended, for construction, capital improvement, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, reconstruction, decommissioning of roads that are no longer needed, including unauthorized roads that are not part of the transportation system, and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532–538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That $40,000,000 shall be designated for urgently needed road decommissioning, road and trail repair and maintenance and associated activities, and removal of fish passage barriers, especially in areas where Forest Service roads may be contributing to water quality problems in streams and water bodies which support threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or community water sources: *Provided further*, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 2016 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury and shall not be available for transfer or obligation for any other purpose unless the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for decommissioning of roads, up to $14,743,000 may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'' to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 et seq.), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $20,000,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POE OF TEXAS

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,000,000)(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Chair, this amendment takes $1 million out of the Forest Service land acquisition account and then, for technical reasons, inserts it back into the same account with the intent to identify unused land for potential sale.

The United States Federal Government currently owns around 640 million acres of land. That is just a number. But that is 27 percent of the landmass in the United States, owned by Uncle Sam. That is the same size as all of Western Europe, if you can imagine that, that being 27 percent of the United States landmass. The Forest Service alone owns over 230 million acres of this Federal land.

This amendment is very simple. All it does is to have the Federal Government examine the land that it has in its possession for the potential sale back to Americans so that Americans can own America.

We are not talking about National Forests. We are not talking about the Grand Canyon. We are talking about unused land that is owned by the Federal Government.

It will have the Federal Government go through that land—27 percent of the landmass in the country—and decide whether some of that might actually be better to be in the possession and the property of Americans so that, if Americans then own the land, that land in some State—like Utah—can then be developed by Americans, and then those people can pay taxes on the land that would go to the State of Utah, for example. Right now the land is unused. It is not able to be productive.

So that is what this amendment would do: have the Forest Service study the possibility of selling some of that unused land back to the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $950,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-Federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 4601-516–617a, 555a; Public Law 96–586; Public Law 76–589, 76–591; and Public Law 78–310).

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $45,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage Federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487), $2,441,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels management on or adjacent to such lands, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, and for State and volunteer fire assistance, $2,373,078,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or

disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $6,914,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation shall be available for the Forest Service in support of fire science research authorized by the Joint Fire Science Program, including all Forest Service authorities for the use of funds, such as contracts, grants, research joint venture agreements, and cooperative agreements: *Provided further*, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research: *Provided further*, That funds provided shall be available for emergency rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuels management activities, support to Federal emergency response, and wildfire suppression activities of the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, $361,749,000 is for hazardous fuels management activities, $19,795,000 is for research activities and to make competitive research grants pursuant to the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act, (16 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.), $78,000,000 is for State fire assistance, and $13,000,000 is for volunteer fire assistance under section 10 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2106): *Provided further*, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'', and ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' accounts to fund forest and rangeland research, the Joint Fire Science Program, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, and wildlife and fish habitat management and restoration: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That up to $15,000,000 of the funds provided herein may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into procurement contracts or cooperative agreements or to issue grants for hazardous fuels management activities and for training or monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels management activities on Federal land or on non-Federal land if the Secretary determines such activities implement a community wildfire protection plan (or equivalent) and benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That funds made available to implement the Community Forest Restoration Act, Public Law 106–393, title VI, shall be available for use on non-Federal lands in accordance with authorities made available to the Forest Service under the ''State and Private Forestry'' appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $50,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for hazardous fuels management, not to exceed $5,000,000 may be used to make grants, using any authorities available to the Forest Service under the ''State and Private Forestry'' appropriation, for the purpose of creating incentives for increased use of biomass from National Forest System lands: *Provided further*, That funds designated for wildfire suppression, including funds transferred from the ''FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund'', shall be assessed for cost pools on the same basis as such assessments are calculated against other agency programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds for hazardous fuels management, up to $28,077,000 may be transferred to the ''National Forest System'' to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $1,000,000) (decreased by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, we still see approximately 3,000 deaths, 17,000 injuries, and $3 billion spent annually as a result of wildfires across the country.

In many ways, wildfires lack parity with nearly every other natural disaster and are hugely underfunded when it comes to mitigation, prevention, and suppression.

Despite the fact the fires often occur in rural communities with smaller populations, wildfires demand intensive resources, equipment, and infrastructure.

The Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program is critical to moving the needle on wildfire management and supporting the men and women who serve in our volunteer fire agencies, including in my district in Colorado. Though this grant program is small and oriented towards lesser trafficked communities, its impact is incredible.

The Volunteer Fire Assistance program provides matching funds to volunteer fire departments protecting communities with 10,000 or fewer residents to purchase equipment and training for use in wildland fire suppression.

Volunteer fire departments provide nearly 80 percent of the initial attack on wildfires across the United States, but, unfortunately, these volunteer fire departments frequently lack the financial resources. And $1 million makes an enormous difference for our volunteer fire departments across the country.

Unfortunately, in recent years, Federal funding for volunteer fire departments to prepare for wildland fire suppression has dwindled. VFA has seen funding reduced from $16 million in FY 2010 to $15.6 million in 2011 and approximately $13 million in FY 2012–2015.

Additionally, the Rural Fire Assistance program, which has historically been funded at $7 to $10 million per year and provided matching grants to fire departments that agreed to assist in responding to wildland fires on Federal lands, hasn't been funded since FY 2010.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, Federal support is critical to ensure volunteer fire departments are able to safely and effectively respond to wildland fires.

The bipartisan amendment I offer today with my colleagues, Representatives RUIZ of California and PETER KING of New York, would help ensure that we have stronger support for our volunteer fire departments across our country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that has been supported by the Congressional Fire Service Institute, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and National Volunteer Fire Council.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for large fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities, $315,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts are only available for transfer to the ''Wildland Fire Management'' account following a declaration by the Secretary in accordance with section 502 of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition of passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; purchase, lease, operation, maintenance, and acquisition of aircraft to maintain the operable fleet for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed $100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions upon the Secretary's notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that all fire suppression funds appropriated under the headings ''Wildland Fire Management''

and ''FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund'' will be obligated within 30 days: *Provided*, That all funds used pursuant to this paragraph must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with U.S., private, and international organizations. The Forest Service, acting for the International Program, may sign direct funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as other domestic agencies (including the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation), U.S. private sector firms, institutions and organizations to provide technical assistance and training programs overseas on forestry and rangeland management.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for expenditure or transfer to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros from National Forest System lands, and for the performance of cadastral surveys to designate the boundaries of such lands.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service in this Act or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257), section 442 of Public Law 106–224 (7 U.S.C. 7772), or section 10417(b) of Public Law 107–107 (7 U.S.C. 8316(b)).

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures contained in the report accompanying this Act.

Not more than $82,000,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture and not more than $14,500,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture for Department Reimbursable Programs, commonly referred to as Greenbook charges. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit or limit the use of reimbursable agreements requested by the Forest Service in order to obtain services from the Department of Agriculture's National Information Technology Center and the Department of Agriculture's International Technology Service.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $5,000,000 shall be available for priority projects within the scope of the approved budget, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps and shall be carried out under the authority of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993, Public Law 103–82, as amended by Public Lands Corps Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2005, Public Law 109–154.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $4,000 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum to the National Forest Foundation to aid conservation partnership projects in support of the Forest Service mission, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98–244, up to $3,000,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in a lump sum to aid cost-share conservation projects, without regard to when expenses are incurred, on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That such funds shall be matched on at least a one-for-one basis by the Foundation or its sub-recipients: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities and natural resource-based businesses for sustainable rural development purposes.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to section 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99–663.

Any funds appropriated to the Forest Service may be used to meet the non-Federal share requirement in section 502(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056(c)(2)).

Funds available to the Forest Service, not to exceed $55,000,000, shall be assessed for the purpose of performing fire, administrative and other facilities maintenance and decommissioning. Such assessments shall occur using a square foot rate charged on the same basis the agency uses to assess programs for payment of rent, utilities, and other support services.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed $500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar nonlitigation-related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

An eligible individual who is employed in any project funded under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) and administered by the Forest Service shall be considered to be a Federal employee for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, $4,321,539,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) and 238b, for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That, $935,726,000 for Purchased/Referred Care, including $51,500,000 for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, of the funds provided, up to $36,000,000 shall remain available until expended for implementation of the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Federal Government as authorized by sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a) during the preceding fiscal year for breach of contracts shall be deposited to the Fund authorized by section 108A of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1) and shall remain available until expended and, notwithstanding section 108A(c) of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1(c)), funds shall be available to make new awards under the loan repayment and scholarship programs under sections 104 and 108 of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a): *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may be used for annual contracts and grants that fall within 2 fiscal years, provided the total obligation is recorded in the year the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, except for those related to the planning, design, or construction of new facilities: *Provided further*, That funding contained herein for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may collect from the Indian Health Service, tribes and tribal organizations operating health facilities pursuant to Public Law 93–638, such individually identifiable health information relating to disabled children as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account: *Provided further*, That $717,970,000 shall be for payments to Indian tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts, or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and an Indian tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) prior to or during fiscal

year 2016, and shall remain available until expended.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, $466,329,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, renovation or expansion of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land on which such facilities will be located: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 may be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,700,000 from this account and the ''Indian Health Services'' account may be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 may be placed in a Demolition Fund, to remain available until expended, and be used by the Indian Health Service for the demolition of Federal buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations provided in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings that relate to the functions or activities of the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651–2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86–121, the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act and Public Law 93–638: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services unless identified in the budget justification and provided in this Act, or approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the reprogramming process: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title V of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: *Provided further*, That with respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities on a reimbursable basis, including payments in advance with subsequent adjustment, and the reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account from which the funds were originally derived, with such amounts to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Indian Health Service shall develop a strategic plan for the Urban Indian Health program in consultation with urban Indians and the National Academy of Public Administration, and shall publish such plan not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9660(a)) and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, $77,349,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i) and 111(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, $74,691,000, of which up to $1,000 per eligible employee of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry shall remain available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited healthcare providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2016, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed $750 for official reception and representation expenses, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $11,000,000: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (Board) shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of EPA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93–531, $7,341,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10: *Provided further*, That $200,000 shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, to remain available until expended, for audits and investigations of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99–498 (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), $9,469,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease agreements of no more than 30 years, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, $680,422,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed $47,522,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, $139,119,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $119,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which not to exceed $3,578,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, for operating lease agreements of no more than 10 years, with no extensions or renewals beyond the 10 years, that address space needs created by the ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan, as authorized, $19,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $21,660,000.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $11,140,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $10,420,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $146,021,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities, through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5 of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, $146,021,000 to remain available until expended, of which $135,121,000 shall be available for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act and for administering the functions of the Act; and $10,900,000 shall be available to carry out the matching grants program pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, including $8,500,000 for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That appropriations for carrying out section 10(a)(2) shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the National Endowment for the Humanities under the provisions of sections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts may approve grants of up to $10,000, if in the aggregate the amount of such grants does not exceed 5 percent of the sums appropriated for grantmaking purposes per year: *Provided further*, That such small grant actions are taken pursuant to the terms of an expressed and direct delegation of authority from the National Council on the Arts to the Chairperson.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts under Chapter 91 of title 40, United States Code, $2,524,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the full costs of its publications, and such fees shall be credited to this account as an offsetting collection, to remain available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Commission is authorized to accept gifts, including objects, papers, artwork, drawings and artifacts, that pertain to the history and design of the Nation's Capital or the history and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts, for the purpose of artistic display, study or education.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99–190 (20 U.S.C. 956a), $2,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89–665), $6,080,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission under chapter 87 of title 40, United States Code, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,948,000: *Provided*, That one-quarter of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading may be used for official reception and representational expenses associated with hosting international visitors engaged in the planning and physical development of world capitals.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, as authorized by Public Law 106–292 (36 U.S.C. 2301–2310), $52,385,000, of which $865,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2018, for the Museum's equipment replacement program; and of which $2,200,000 for the Museum's repair and rehabilitation program and $1,264,000 for the Museum's outreach initiatives program shall remain available until expended.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which Congressional action is not complete other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

OBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

DISCLOSURE OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 403. The amount and basis of estimated overhead charges, deductions, reserves or holdbacks, including working capital fund and cost pool charges, from programs, projects, activities and subactivities to support government-wide, departmental, agency, or bureau administrative functions or headquarters, regional, or central operations shall be presented in annual budget justifications and subject to approval by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Changes to such estimates shall be presented to the Committees on Appropriations for approval.

MINING APPLICATIONS

SEC. 404. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994; and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims, sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2017, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on actions taken by the Department under the plan submitted pursuant to section 314(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208).

(d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process patent applications in a timely and responsible manner, upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified third-party contractor to be selected by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent application as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, PRIOR YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 405. Sections 405 and 406 of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) shall continue in effect in fiscal year 2016.

CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, FISCAL YEAR 2016 LIMITATION

SEC. 406. Amounts provided by this Act for fiscal year 2016 under the headings ''Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Indian Health Services'' and ''Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, Operation of Indian Programs'' are the only amounts available for contract support costs arising out of self-determination or self-governance contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements for fiscal year 2016 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That such amounts provided by this Act are not available for payment of claims for contract support costs for prior years, or for repayments of payments for settlements or judgments awarding contract support costs for prior years.

FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not be considered to be in violation of subparagraph 6(f)(5)(A) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5)(A)) solely because more than 15 years have passed without revision of the plan for a unit of the National Forest System. Nothing in this section exempts the Secretary from any other requirement of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) or any other law: *Provided*, That if the Secretary is not acting expeditiously and in good faith, within the funding available, to revise a plan for a unit of the National Forest System, this section shall be void with respect to such plan and a court of proper jurisdiction may order completion of the plan on an accelerated basis.

PROHIBITION WITHIN NATIONAL MONUMENTS

SEC. 408. No funds provided in this Act may be expended to conduct preleasing, leasing and related activities under either the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) within the boundaries of a National Monument established pursuant to the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) as such boundary existed on January 20, 2001, except where such activities are allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing such monument.

LIMITATION ON TAKINGS

SEC. 409. Unless otherwise provided herein, no funds appropriated in this Act for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands may be expended for the filing of declarations of taking or complaints in condemnation without the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to funds appropriated to implement the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, or to funds appropriated for Federal assistance to the State of Florida to acquire lands for Everglades restoration purposes.

TIMBER SALE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 410. No timber sale in Alaska's Region 10 shall be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit (defined as the value of the timber is not sufficient to cover all logging and stumpage costs and provide a normal profit and risk allowance under the Forest Service's appraisal process) when appraised using a residual value appraisal. The western red cedar timber from those sales which is surplus to the needs of the domestic processors in Alaska, shall be made available to domestic processors in the contiguous 48 United States at prevailing domestic prices. All additional western red cedar volume not sold to Alaska or contiguous 48 United States domestic processors may be exported to foreign markets at the election of the timber sale holder. All Alaska yellow cedar may be sold at prevailing export prices at the election of the timber sale holder.

PROHIBITION ON NO-BID CONTRACTS

SEC. 411. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to executive branch agencies may be used to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless—

(1) Federal law specifically authorizes a contract to be entered into without regard for these requirements, including formula grants for States, or federally recognized Indian tribes; or

(2) such contract is authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93–638, 25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or by any other Federal laws that specifically authorize a contract within an Indian tribe as defined in section 4(e) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)); or

(3) such contract was awarded prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

POSTING OF REPORTS

SEC. 412. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANT GUIDELINES

SEC. 413. Of the funds provided to the National Endowment for the Arts—

(1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant to an individual if such grant is awarded to such individual for a literature fellowship, National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship.

(2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures to ensure that no funding provided through a grant, except a grant made to a State or local arts agency, or regional group, may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual to conduct activity independent of the direct grant recipient. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments made in exchange for goods and services.

(3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support to a group, unless the application is specific to the contents of the season, including identified programs or projects.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS PROGRAM PRIORITIES

SEC. 414. (a) In providing services or awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appropriated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term ''underserved population'' means a population of individuals, including urban minorities, who have historically been outside the purview of arts and humanities programs due to factors such as a high incidence of income below the poverty line or to geographic isolation.

(2) The term ''poverty line'' means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(c) In providing services and awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts.

(d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—

(1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant category for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that are of national impact or availability or are able to tour several States;

(2) the Chairperson shall not make grants exceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds to any single State, excluding grants made under the authority of paragraph (1);

(3) the Chairperson shall report to the Congress annually and by State, on grants awarded by the Chairperson in each grant category under section 5 of such Act; and

(4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of grants to improve and support community-based music performance and education.

STATUS OF BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 415. The Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service shall provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate quarterly reports on the status of balances of appropriations including all uncommitted, committed, and unobligated funds in each program and activity.

REPORT ON USE OF CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDS

SEC. 416. Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request is submitted to the Congress, the President shall submit a comprehensive report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate describing in detail all Federal agency funding, domestic and international, for climate change programs, projects, and activities in fiscal years 2015 and 2016, including an accounting of funding by agency with each agency identifying climate change programs, projects, and activities and associated costs by line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix, and including citations and linkages where practicable to each strategic plan that is driving funding within each climate change program, project, and activity listed in the report.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 416.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the overwhelming scientific consensus is that climate change is real. Leaders of the communities of faith, such as His Holiness the Pope, are now urging us to take this issue very seriously.

No matter how often the fossil fuel industry whispers that we have nothing to worry about, no matter how much manufactured science they gin up to create doubt, climate change is real.

We should have begun assessing the costs of climate change decades ago, but we did not. The legislation before us today would require a report on climate change expenditures. But the purpose of this section is not to assess the impacts of climate change; the purpose is to root out climate funding in the budget, so that next year's Interior bill can prohibit that spending.

Madam Chair, the report requirement as written is not only pointless, it is counterproductive. The Obama administration is open about responding to climate change. Most of their climate expenditures are clearly labeled and can be discovered by simply reading their budget request. For the remainder, I would be happy to write the President asking him to list these programs, and I suspect he would be pleased to answer.

As written, this reporting requirement is a waste of time. We should be instead asking the administration to report back to us on the costs of climate change to our health, our environment, and our economy.

Earlier this week, the White House issued a report showing that its efforts to reduce air pollution and climate change—efforts opposed by House Republicans, I might add—would provide billions of dollars in health benefits and save hundreds of thousands of lives.

A report also out this week from the National Park Service showed that $90 billion of National Park resources are at risk from sea level rise caused by global warming, and we all know about the historic drought in California and the lingering costs of recovery from Superstorm Sandy.

A full assessment of all the costs of inaction would help inform the Congress and the American people about what steps we must take immediately to ensure that climate change does not bring our country to its knees. Unfortunately, this bill does not ask for that assessment.

Instead, Madam Chair, the section my amendment would strike would undertake some kind of witch hunt to root out the meager funding we have in place to respond to this challenge. To support this section is to deny climate change.

I would tell my colleagues, all the constituent services you provide, all the money you can raise, the votes you cast, and the laws you pass will amount to nothing if you are on the wrong side of history on climate change. Climate deniers will join a long list of political figures who failed to respond to the most serious challenge of their time and so are labeled as failures for all time.

Therefore, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment to strike the reporting language in the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this provision shouldn't be controversial. The language has been included in our enacted bills on a bipartisan basis since 2010. The language simply requires that programs and activities dedicated to climate change are reported in a transparent way so the American people know what we are spending their tax dollars on.

With so many climate change programs being initiated, it is important to know what is being done across the government to avoid redundancy, and there is certainly a significant amount of redundancy in some of these climate change studies. It is in the bill so the committee can have the information it needs to provide critical oversight.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 417. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available

in this Act or any other Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of permits under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.) for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.

GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 418. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to implement any provision in a rule, if that provision requires mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems.

RECREATION FEE

SEC. 419. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) is amended by striking ''10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on September 30, 2017''.

MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES

SEC. 420. (a) Section 8162(m)(3) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106–79) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''September 30, 2016''.

(b) For fiscal year 2016, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction'' in division E of Public Law 112–74 shall not be in effect.

FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 421. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to regulate the lead content of ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) or any other law.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 422. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.), including the provisions of the rules dated November 13, 1986, and August 25, 1993, relating to said jurisdiction, and the guidance documents dated January 15, 2003, and December 2, 2008, relating to said jurisdiction.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 422.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would strike section 422 from the underlying bill. In doing so, this amendment would allow the EPA and the Army to implement the waters of the United States rule. This rule will ensure protection for the Nation's public health and aquatic resources and will clarify the scope of the waters of the United States protected under this law.

Unfortunately, Republicans continue to undermine efforts to protect the Great Lakes as well as other critical water bodies around the Nation. We cannot afford to delay years of work by the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers that would enhance the protection of our Nation's aquatic resources and public health.

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

□ 1515

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, it comes as no surprise that I rise in opposition to this amendment.

In 2006, the Supreme Court determined the EPA and the Corps of Engineers did not have the authority to regulate nonnavigable waters under the Clean Water Act.

I am certain the EPA's final rule violates that. From day one, the EPA claimed that they were not expanding the waters under their jurisdiction, but we now know that those permits will be required and that the final rule is worse than proposed.

Twenty-seven States have now filed lawsuits challenging the legality of EPA's rule, so the Agency again finds itself on shaky legal ground, both on process and substance.

The language in the bill protects the authority of the States by preventing the EPA from implementing its regulation and expanding its jurisdiction. The language needs to stay in, so I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The language is in there for a very good reason. Everybody assumes that the waters are not covered under the Clean Water Act, that being the navigable waters. That is a definition they came up with somehow—I don't know—but that they are unregulated waters.

They are not unregulated waters. They are regulated by the States. When the court said, ''Navigable waters is kind of an elusive term, so maybe you ought to redefine it,'' the EPA said, ''Okay, we will just regulate all the waters,'' and that is what they did with this. They have gone way beyond whatever the intent of the Clean Water Act was.

I will tell you most resource groups, most agricultural groups, everybody else disagrees with what the EPA has done on this new rule that they are writing. The fact that they have expanded their authority into areas far beyond what was intended in the Clean Water Act, I think, goes beyond the pale and goes beyond what Congress originally intended under the Clean Water Act.

We are not talking about leaving waters unregulated; they are just being regulated by the States, and they need to start over in writing this rule.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Chair, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 4 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), my colleague.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I thank my colleague.

I rise to support the Lawrence amendment to strike the section prohibiting the new rule on the Federal jurisdiction of the waters of the United States.

A few weeks ago, the Obama administration issued a final rule that clarifies the limits of Federal authority under the Clean Water Act. It does this by reducing red tape and providing more certainty for the regulated community.

Instead of confusion in case-by-case determinations about where waters are covered, the rule says physical, measurable boundaries for the first time about where clean water coverage begins and ends.

The rule does not expand the waters covered. In fact, it will actually reduce the scope of waters protected by the Clean Water Act.

Additionally, the rule does not create any new permitting requirements for agriculture. It maintains all previous exemptions and exclusions.

The rule ensures that the waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined and predictably measured, making permitting less costly, easier, and faster for business and industry.

Prohibiting the EPA from implementing the rule will only perpetrate confusion in the jurisdiction of the water.

This harmful rider should be struck; therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Lawrence amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I strongly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment as it seeks to strip a commonsense provision included in the base bill that will protect the American people from the EPA's new waters of the U.S. regulation, commonly referred to as WOTUS.

WOTUS is a terrible Agency proposal that will have disastrous effects and economic consequences for agriculture, small business, property owners, municipalities, and other water users throughout the country.

This job-killing, overreaching water grab being imposed by Washington bureaucrats is a dream killer for future generations and local economies. The EPA claims this new regulation was

shaped by public input; yet we recently learned that the EPA used taxpayer dollars to unleash a propaganda campaign in an attempt to rally comments and support for this WOTUS regulation, despite the Anti-Lobbying Act which bans such actions.

Furthermore, States and local governments that have traditionally managed these waterways and activities were not included in drafting the WOTUS regulation. The Agency failed to comply with the Regulatory Flexibility Act as required by Federal law and consider the new impact that the WOTUS regulations would have on small businesses.

The EPA claims this rule is grounded in law; yet this overreaching regulation contradicts prior Supreme Court decisions by expanding Agency control over 60 percent of our country's streams and millions of acres of wetlands that were previously nonjurisdictional.

Despite claiming the WOTUS rule reduces Agency jurisdiction, the final regulation imposes new regulations for navigable waters and their tributaries, potholes, ditches, bays, and even waters that are next to rivers and lakes.

The new WOTUS regulation has been built on a foundation of pseudoscience, deception, and lawlessness. This overreach is so extreme that 24 Members of the President's own party joined Members in the House in passing legislation in May calling for the formal withdrawal of the new WOTUS regulation.

For these reasons and more, I strongly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment and urge its defeat.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Chair, I would really urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The rule does not create any new permitting requirements for the agriculture and maintains all previous exemptions and exclusions. The rule ensures that waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined and particularly determine making permitting less costly, easier, and faster for business and industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Chair, I think the American public must be quite confused about what we are currently debating in this Chamber.

The amendment I rise in strong support of strikes section 422 which prevents funds from being used to "develop, adopt, implement, administer or enforce any change . . . pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction" of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

I would like to remind the other side that, thanks to the Clean Water Act, billions of pounds of pollution have been kept out of our rivers, and the number of waters that now meet clean water goals nationwide has actually doubled with direct benefits for drinking water, public health, recreation, and wildlife.

This is especially true for my home State of Maryland that is within the six-State Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed is fed by 110,000 miles of creeks, rivers, and streams; covers 64,000 square miles; includes over 11,500 miles of shorelines; contains 150 major rivers and streams; and is home to over 17 million people.

And this watershed's land-to-water ratio is 14–1, the largest of any coastal water body in the world.

Several of its tributaries, including the Anacostia, the Patuxent, Potomac, and Severn Rivers flow through the Fourth Congressional District. 70 percent of Marylanders get our drinking water from sources that rely on headwater or seasonal streams.

Nationwide, 117 million people, or over a third of the total population, get our water from these waters.

However, due to the two Supreme Court decisions, there is, in fact, widespread confusion as to what falls under the protection of the Clean Water Act.

That is precisely why the Obama administration finalized their rule clarifying the limits of Federal jurisdiction under the Act on May 27, 2015.

The agencies finalized the clean water protection rule after over a year of public outreach on their then proposed rule at a scale unprecedented in the history of the Clean Water Act, as well as countless congressional hearings.

Madam Chair, supporters of this provision have complained about the confusion in the litigation.

That is precisely why we needed to get through the final rulemaking, which has been years in the making.

That is what the Supreme Court instructed the Federal Government to do 14 years ago with the 2001 SWANCC decision and, subsequently, the 2006 Rapanos case.

Along with those Supreme Court decisions, the Bush administration followed the exact same process in issuing two guidance documents in 2003 and 2008.

Up until the final rule issued just over a month ago, they remained in force.

It is, in fact, these two Bush-era guidance documents that have compounded the confusion, uncertainty, and increased compliance costs faced by our constituents—opponents and proponents alike—who all just say they want clarity.

You don't actually have to take my word for it.

In fact, let me quote from the comments made by the American Farm Bureau Federation, something I don't do all that often: "With no clear regulatory definitions to guide their determinations, what has emerged is a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories."

Those are the words of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

We all agree that it is confusing.

That is why it was so important that this administration finish what the Bush administration started and failed to do, and that is publish a final rule that gives stakeholders the clarity they have been seeking for 14 years.

Madam Chair, despite nearly universal calls for increased clarity and certainty from certain stakeholders, my colleagues have made it a priority to prohibit the implementation of the final clean water rulemaking entirely.

It is really clear that what they want to do is stop these agencies from doing their jobs at all—no new rules and no clean water, what a shame for our natural resources, our public health, and our environment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Quigley-Edwards amendment to strike this harmful and shameful provision.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STREAM BUFFER

SEC. 423. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, carry out, or implement (1) any guidance, policy, or directive to reinterpret or change the historic interpretation of 30 C.F.R. 816.57, which was promulgated on June 30, 1983 by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior (48 Fed. Reg. 30312); or (2) proposed regulations or supporting materials described in the Federal Register notice published on June 18, 2010 (75 Fed. Reg. 34667) by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning at page 122, line 23, strike section 423.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, my amendment would allow the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to continue to develop regulations designed to protect communities and the environment from the devastating effects of mountaintop removal mining.

If you have seen a picture of a mountaintop removal mining site, you get an idea of how destructive this process is. Companies literally blast the tops off of mountains, scoop out the coal, and dump what used to be the mountaintop into the valley below. The scars on the landscape are unmistakable, as are the piles of rock filling in what used to be mountain valleys and streams.

What you don't see in the picture is the health impacts on the people living nearby, although those are just as real and just as terrible. People who live near mountaintop mining sites have higher rates of lung cancer, heart disease, kidney disease, birth defects, hypertension, and other health related problems.

Despite some confusion in the Natural Resources Committee just last month, these results are statistically corrected for rates of smoking, obesity, and other factors.

A paper in the journal Science a few years ago, one of the preeminent scientific journals in the world, pointed

out that mountaintop removal mining with valley fills ''revealed serious environmental impacts that mitigation practices cannot successfully address,'' that ''water emerges from the base of valley fills containing a variety of solutes toxic and damaging to biota,'' and ''recovery of biodiversity in mining waste-impacted streams has not been documented.''

Under our laws governing surface coal mining, streams are supposed to be protected; but the existing regulations, which are over 30 years old, have done a poor job of doing just that. Over 2,000 miles of streams have been buried by mountaintop removal mining, and countless more have been polluted by toxic mine runoff. Wildlife habitat is destroyed; fish are killed, and the people in the area suffer.

That is why the administration has been working for years on a new rule that would do a better job of protecting streams. It has taken longer than I would like for them to propose this rule, and the process has certainly not gone as smoothly as it could have.

The majority uses the snags in the process to argue that there shouldn't be a rule at all. Never mind that their own partisan investigation delayed this rule for years without uncovering any evidence of political misconduct.

The majority also claims that this rule will cause huge job losses, but the draft rule hasn't even been published yet, so we can't possibly know the impacts, and the Director of the Office of Surface Mining says the job losses will be minor at best.

Even if the majority does not believe him—and I suspect they might not—they should wait until the draft rule comes out and there can be independent analysis of the impacts, not just wild exaggerations that the mining industry will produce, but real, independent analysis.

If they are still not happy with the rule at that point, we can hold hearings. We can try to pass constructive laws that protect the environment and human health and workers all at the same time.

A partisan rider in this bill that completely stops the ability of the administration to work on this stream buffer rule to provide badly needed protections to Appalachian communities is the wrong way to go.

It has nothing to do with managing spending. In fact, it would just result in the waste of all the money that was required to get to this very point.

The rider is bad policy; it is bad for the environment, and it is bad for public health and the health of the people living near these mines.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment that would allow the stream protection rule to see the light of day.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, in 2008, the Office of Surface Mining finalized revisions to the stream zone buffer rule in an open and transparent manner. After taking office, the Obama administration put a hold on the rule and is currently writing a new rule.

The administration's approach under the new rule has been anything but collaborative and inclusive, and many States feel they have been shut out of the process. When Chairman ROGERS required advanced analysis on job impacts, his request was ignored.

The American people expect more openness and transparency from their government, and that is why this funding prohibition must remain in the base bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and reject this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING ON FEDERAL LAND

SEC. 424. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to prohibit the use of or access to Federal land (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)) for hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if such use or access—

(1) was not prohibited on such Federal land as of January 1, 2013; and

(2) was conducted in compliance with the resource management plan (as defined in section 101 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6511)) applicable to such Federal land as of January 1, 2013.

(b) TEMPORARY CLOSURES ALLOWED.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may temporarily close, for a period not to exceed 30 days, Federal land managed by the Secretary to hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if the Secretary determines that the temporary closure is necessary to accommodate a special event or for public safety reasons. The Secretary may extend a temporary closure for one additional 90-day period only if the Secretary determines the extension is necessary because of extraordinary weather conditions or for public safety reasons.

(c) AUTHORITY OF STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY

SEC. 425. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning at page 124, line 17, strike section 425.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chair, nearly 3 years ago, Superstorm Sandy caught millions of coastal residents by surprise and cost billions of dollars in economic damage. Unfortunately, the weather is not all that has become more extreme over the past several years.

I am disappointed that this misguided and misinformed language to block implementation of the National Ocean Policy keeps coming back, just like the recurrent coastal flooding being caused by sea level rise, and my amendment would strike that language.

□ 1530

It shows a lack of respect for science and a lack of appreciation for the magnitude and complexity of the governance challenges we face.

It seems some Members of Congress do not want to see government succeed even when government's failure to respond to a disaster, to predict a drought, or to properly manage a fishery can devastate the communities they represent.

When you disavow words like ''precaution,'' ''preparedness,'' and ''planning,'' you stop being conservative and start being reckless.

Conservatives always say they want to run government like a business. Well, would you invest in a business with different departments that don't talk to each other? Would you invest in a business that is not responsive to its shareholders? Would you invest in a business with no business plan?

That is essentially what the National Ocean Policy is, a business plan for the oceans that seeks to maximize the benefits for shareholders, all the American people.

The policy is a win-win-win for economic growth, public safety, and environmental protection. I urge you to vote ''yes'' on my amendment to protect the National Ocean Policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I have operated a business. Ever since this administration created the National Ocean Policy through executive order,

the subcommittee has asked the CEQ, the DOI, and the EPA to provide an estimate of the impact of the Policy on their budgets, and we have yet to receive a substantial answer.

The so-called report we were provided last year was fewer than three pages long. Clearly, this failed to outline expenditures supporting the administration's National Ocean Policy.

Our job here is to pay the bills. When we ask how much does the National Ocean Policy cost, we expect to get an answer. We need an answer so that proper congressional oversight can be conducted.

I want to point out that this language was included in the House fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. There are concerns about the costs and all of the unknowns related to this policy in multiple jurisdictions.

The bottom line is, if this administration wants the funds to implement the National Ocean Policy, then tell us how much it is going to cost the taxpayer. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), my colleague.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Chair, Congress has enacted numerous laws that manage the ocean and coastal issues across 11 of the 15 Cabinet-level departments and four independent agencies across the Federal Government. As my colleague from Massachusetts pointed out, why wouldn't we want these folks to be working together?

Clearly, what the President is trying to do is to just have an action that lets the independent bipartisan commission move forward, including the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, which was appointed entirely by President George W. Bush.

The National Ocean Policy is a means by which the Federal agencies can sort through all of the tangles of uncoordinated governance and can bring some common sense to the chaos. Wouldn't we want that?

If my colleagues have a problem with what government can do on ocean management, then they have a problem with laws that are enacted by Congress, not with the National Ocean Policy or with the President's executive order, because what the President is doing through the National Ocean Policy is following a well-established Presidential tradition of using an executive order to supervise and guide agencies under the President's charge as they execute existing laws passed by Congress.

Let us let this agency get to work. Let us find out how we could be more effective with our agencies working together.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank Chairman CALVERT for his work on this bill.

Madam Chair, I want to set the record straight. In the year 2000, Congress did pass a bill during the 106th Congress to create an ocean commission to review and to make recommendations.

Yes, President Bush did appoint persons to that commission. They did make those recommendations, and those recommendations were submitted to Congress.

Since then, those recommendations have been reviewed by the 108th, the 109th, the 110th, and the 111th Congresses, and each of those Congresses decided that no action should be taken.

What happened here is the President decided to go into the Article I powers, which are reserved for Congress, and to do what Congress does not intend to have done, which is to have an ocean zoning commission built from dozens of agencies.

They have never asked for an appropriations for this activity, and there is no lawful basis for the activity to exist. The President's executive order is basically violating the statutes that have been passed by Congress, and it is also violating the Constitution.

The language that is in the appropriations bill should remain as it is. Congress has voted seven times on this language, and it has passed all seven times on a bipartisan basis. The other side is that of basically trying to undo what Congress has said it wants to do seven times on a bipartisan basis.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, which would allow for the implementation of the National Ocean Policy.

Plain and simple, coordinated ocean planning makes common sense and is a good economic policy for our coastal communities. It allows for a comprehensive mapping of existing ocean uses that helps to identify and resolve conflicts between stakeholders before they play out in specific permitting processes.

In Virginia, this process has been crucial to preserving public access to the ocean, to sustain economic growth, to address marine debris, to create migration corridors for marine mammals, and to support promising new ocean industries, such as wind power and marine aquaculture.

In fact, I am proud to note that Virginia was recently selected by BOEM to be the first State in the Nation to receive a wind energy research lease in Federal waters. This rider would eliminate language that would undermine regional collaborative efforts to manage existing and future ocean policy challenges.

Let's not roll back the valuable work and resources that many States, industries, and communities have already devoted to implementing this policy. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank Chairman CALVERT.

Madam Chair, again, I want to set the record straight. We are not against ocean planning, as it makes perfect sense, but only insofar as Congress has explicitly authorized those activities.

Congress has not allowed the President to do what he is trying to do by executive fiat. There are 67 groups, which include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries, that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach. Again, it is an unconstitutional Federal overreach, and I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment.

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Chair, I do appreciate that my colleague across the aisle has said that it does make perfect sense to have an ocean policy. The ocean policy is a business plan for the oceans that seeks to maximize the benefits for all of its shareholders, the American people.

I certainly know that we in Massachusetts have a great appreciation for the complex task it seeks to undertake in order to protect that which we value most, the ocean off our coast.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEAD TEST KIT

SEC. 426. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce regulations under subpart E of part 745 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (commonly referred to as the ''Lead; Renovation, Repair, and Painting Rule''), or any subsequent amendments to such regulations, until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency publicizes Environmental Protection Agency recognition of a commercially available lead test kit that meets both criteria under section 745.88(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

FINANCIAL ASSURANCE

SEC. 427. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any regulation that would establish new financial responsibility requirements pursuant to section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)).

GHG NSPS

SEC. 428. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce—

(1) any standard of performance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C.

7411(b)) for any new fossil fuel-fired electricity utility generating unit if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's determination that a technology is adequately demonstrated includes consideration of one or more facilities for which assistance is provided (including any tax credit) under subtitle A of title IV of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15961 et seq.) or section 48A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) any regulation or guidance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) establishing any standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any modified or reconstructed source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit; or

(3) any regulation or guidance under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) that applies to the emission of any greenhouse gas by an existing source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit.

DEFINITION OF FILL MATERIAL

SEC. 429. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 429.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

The amendment strikes a rider that would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from updating regulations pertaining to the definitions of the terms ''fill material'' or ''discharge of fill material'' for purposes of the Clean Water Act.

Presently, the Army Corps of Engineers issues a section 404 permit if the fill material discharged into a water body raises the bottom elevation of that water body or converts the area to dry land.

The current rule allows mining waste to be dumped into the rivers and streams without an appropriate environmental review process.

Given repeated instances of mining activities resulting in lakes and streams devoid of fish or aquatic life, downstream water users are rightly concerned that the section 404 process fails to protect them from the discharge of hazardous substances.

The Clean Water Act section 404 guidelines are not well suited for evaluating the environmental effects of discharging hazardous waste, such as mining refuse and similar materials, into a water body or a wetland.

The rider that this amendment strikes would block the EPA from making necessary modifications to these guidelines. This rider is a preemptive strike against protecting our drinking water, and it allows mining companies' interests to trump the protection of the health of our citizens.

We should not short-circuit regular order through the appropriations process. We should not preclude the Corps or the EPA from considering any regulatory changes to the current definition and permit process. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment to strike this language from the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, this language simply maintains the status quo regarding the definition of ''fill material'' for the purposes of the Clean Water Act.

The existing definition was put in place through a rule-making initiated by the Clinton administration and finalized by the Bush administration. That rule harmonized the definitions on the books of the Corps and the EPA so that both agencies were working with the same definition.

Any attempts to redefine this important definition could significantly negatively impact the ability of all earth-moving industries, road and highway construction, and private and commercial enterprises to obtain vital Clean Water Act section 404 permits.

Changing the definition of ''fill material'' could result in the loss of up to 375,000 high-paying mining jobs and jeopardize over 1 million jobs that are dependent upon the economic output generated by these operations.

For these reasons, I support the underlying language and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Chair, I respect the chairman's objections to this, but I would like to point out that all that this amendment does in striking the section is allow the EPA to consider future changes to the ''fill'' definitions.

Clearly, the work begun in the Clinton administration and finalized in the George W. Bush administration were the best possible actions at the time.

In the meantime, we have discovered that, unfortunately, much mining waste and refuse are ending up in mining streams and rivers, and it has severely affected the health of those people.

We are not attempting to eliminate mining jobs or to even impact earth moving. It is only reasonable to make sure that our Environmental Protection Agency has the latitude and the freedom to evolve future definitions so as to best protect the health of our citizens.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. CALVERT. I oppose this amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES

SEC. 430. Section 412 of division E of Public Law 112–74 is amended by striking ''fiscal year 2015,'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2017,''.

CHESAPEAKE BAY INITIATIVE

SEC. 431. Section 502(c) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–312; 16 U.S.C. 461 note) is amended by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2017''.

EXTENSION OF GRAZING PERMITS

SEC. 432. The terms and conditions of section 325 of Public Law 108–108 (117 Stat. 1307), regarding grazing permits issued by the Forest Service on any lands not subject to administration under section 402 of the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1752), shall remain in effect for fiscal year 2016.

AVAILABILITY OF VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 433. The Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the National Forest System lands, shall make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by either Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease or other grazing lands used by the holder of the permit or lease are unusable because of drought or wildfire, as determined by the Secretary concerned. The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease made available pursuant to this section shall be the same as the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to the vacant grazing allotment made available. Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) shall not apply with respect to any Federal agency action under this section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I offer an amendment to strike section 433.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 433.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I offer my amendment to strike section 433 regarding the availability of vacant grazing allotments and waiving one of our key environmental laws.

While grazing on our public lands is an important part of our Nation's culture and economy, this section of the appropriations bill is redundant and unnecessary. The BLM and Forest Service already have the authority to transfer permits when grazing lands are deemed unusable.

Furthermore, this section would have the effect of waiving section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. NEPA is one of our Nation's bedrock environmental laws, serving to

establish policies to protect our air, water, and our natural resources. Section 102 of NEPA contains key provisions to make sure that Federal agencies act according to the spirit and letter of the law.

By stating that section 102 shall not apply to agency actions, this bill is, in essence, waiving NEPA and putting our public lands at risk. Our Federal agencies did not ask for a NEPA waiver, and Congress should not be in the business of dictating to professional land managers when they should or should not have the flexibility to use NEPA in making land management decisions.

Allowing section 433 to be included in the appropriations bill could have unintended consequences for our public lands and environment, particularly when conditions on the ground change. In this time of climate change, drought, and wildfire, it is vital that agencies have the tools and the flexibility to conduct adequate environmental reviews.

In the face of these challenges, why should grazers get to jump to the front of the line for new land? What about land for species and recovery and habitat that are displaced by climate change or recreational demands and interests?

Congress has tasked the BLM with managing our public lands for multiple uses. I welcome the belated recognition by my Republican colleagues that climate change is impacting these lands, but this provision would waive the balancing process found in NEPA and mandate that grazing gets to trump other uses when lands are destroyed by fire or drought.

Section 433 benefits one special interest above all others, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting to strike this section from the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The amendment would strike a commonsense provision—repeat, commonsense provision—in this bill that allows the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to make available vacant grazing allotments when a rancher is forced off his or her existing allotment due to drought or wildfire.

It is not that they jump to the front of the line and have special provisions because of this. The fact is, if you don't exclude the NEPA process, it can take 3 months, 6 months—guess what? Cows and sheep don't go on a diet for 3 months or 6 months. They actually need to put these cows and sheep somewhere, and vacant allotments is what they look for.

The gentleman says that this is redundant, that they can already do that. Well, if they can already do it, then what the heck? Why is he opposed to this provision?

Unfortunately, drought and catastrophic wildfires are all too common in the West. Ranchers shouldn't be further penalized when they lose their allotments due to natural disasters. The provision provides some flexibility to the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service to help in these circumstances.

It doesn't say, ''You will provide these vacant allotments.'' It says, ''You may.'' It is not a must. We are trying to give the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service the flexibility to use vacant allotments when circumstances are required.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Grijalva amendment. As has been pointed out, BLM already has the authority to make vacant grazing allotments available for permittees on a discretionary basis where the permittee is adversely impacted by wildfire or drought, but unlike the discretionary basis on which the BLM currently makes these allotments, this rider would exempt the National Environmental Policy Act, a NEPA review.

On page 127, line 25, it reads ''with respect to'' the National Forest System lands, ''shall''—not may—''shall make vacant,'' and so what the BLM currently can do is they can conduct a NEPA review in areas where they think they have concerns and they can ensure that the land, health standards, and resources are not going to be compromised because the BLM has a role to play in protecting these lands for grazing potential in the future so that they are not harmed or overgrazed.

To me, it makes common sense that the rider should not exempt the BLM from a regulatory requirement to issue a decision and conduct an administrative review, which they currently can choose to do or choose not to do based on the information that they have. Any grazing that is mandated by this rider is likely also to find itself caught up by hearings and delays and appeals and judicial review.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment to strike the unnecessary rider and to leave the discretion in place so it continues to be the National Forest System lands may be made vacant.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I would ask my colleagues just one thing. If you are a rancher and you have had one of these catastrophic wildfires come through—and they come through frequently, unfortunately—and they have wiped out your grazing allotment, what do you tell your cows? What do you tell your sheep? What do they eat for the next several months as you go through the NEPA process? This is giving some flexibility to the Forest Service and to the BLM.

I know we can all say: Oh, gee, they can make arrangements and do it otherwise and so forth.

This is just a commonsense provision, frankly, and we haven't had any problem with it with the time that it has been in existence. I think it should stay in existence, and that is why the chairman has included it in this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, the redundancy comes from the fact that that flexibility has existed in BLM and Forest Service; it has existed for years. The situations of wildfires have occurred, and they have been handled.

It is an unnecessary NEPA waiver. It is a redundant amendment, addition to it. The NEPA waiver in the writing says it is not optional. It says ''shall.''

I urge Members to support my amendment striking section 433.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, this language has been in the bill since 2003. It hasn't caused any problems. It has fed a lot of cows. I think it is a good provision in the bill, and we should defeat this amendment. It is a bad amendment. Vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROTECTION OF WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 434. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer of any water right, including sole and joint ownership, directly to the United States, or any impairment of title, in whole or in part, granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact. Additionally, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to require any water user to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement.

LIMITATION ON STATUS CHANGES

SEC. 435. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce any regulation or guidance under Section 612 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671k) that changes the status from acceptable to unacceptable for purposes of the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program of any hydrofluorocarbon used as a refrigerant or in foam blowing agents, applications or uses. Nothing in this section shall prevent EPA from approving

new materials, applications or uses as acceptable under the SNAP program.

USE OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL

SEC. 436. (a)(1) None of the funds made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized by section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12) shall be used for a project for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a public water system or treatment works unless all of the iron and steel products used in the project are produced in the United States.

(2) In this section, the term ''iron and steel'' products means the following products made primarily of iron or steel: lined or unlined pipes and fittings, manhole covers and other municipal castings, hydrants, tanks, flanges, pipe clamps and restraints, valves, structural steel, reinforced precast concrete, and construction materials.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case or category of cases in which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Administrator'') finds that—

(1) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron and steel products are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) inclusion of iron and steel products produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

(c) If the Administrator receives a request for a waiver under this section, the Administrator shall make available to the public on an informal basis a copy of the request and information available to the Administrator concerning the request, and shall allow for informal public input on the request for at least 15 days prior to making a finding based on the request. The Administrator shall make the request and accompanying information available by electronic means, including on the official public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(d) This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

(e) The Administrator may retain up to 0.25 percent of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for carrying out the provisions described in subsection (a)(1) for management and oversight of the requirements of this section.

SOCIAL COST OF CARBON

SEC. 437. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act shall be used for the social cost of carbon (SCC) to be incorporated into any rulemaking or guidance document until a new Interagency Working Group (IWG) revises the estimates using the discount rates and the domestic-only limitation on benefits estimates in accordance with Executive Order 12866 and OMB Circular A-4 as of January 1, 2015: *Provided*, That such IWG shall provide to the public all documents, models, and assumptions used in developing the SCC and solicit public comment prior to finalizing any revised estimates.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk to strike section 437.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 437.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, my amendment, which I offer along with Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. PETERS, would simply remove one of the so-called policy riders from this bill. It is a particularly dangerous policy rider.

What my amendment would do is it would strip the bill of a harmful and unrelated restriction that actually would prohibit Federal agencies from assessing the social cost of carbon, meaning Federal agencies would not be able to look at the monetized impact, the actual costs of climate change.

They would be forced to deliberately have a blindfold and not be allowed to consider climate change in their planning, just like American businesses do, like States do, like municipalities do, but the Federal Government would be prohibited from even looking at the costs of climate change.

According to a recent poll undertaken by Stanford University, 81 percent of American people have looked at the science and agree that climate change is at least in part caused by humans; 74 percent of Americans believe the Federal Government should be working hard to combat climate change, and 71 percent of the American people expect that they will be hurt personally or impacted by climate change.

Madam Speaker, climate change is not some fallacy. It is not some evil plot by leftwing or rightwing extremists. It is simply science. Climate change is what major corporations like Coca-Cola and Nike have called an economically disruptive force that needs to be addressed.

Acting on climate change is what the most high profile religious leader on the planet has called a moral imperative, an economic imperative, a moral imperative. It is what the Department of Defense has called an ''immediate risk to U.S. national security.''

I would ask my colleagues on the other side to adopt this amendment so that we don't ignore the calls of business, Defense, religious leaders—among thousands of others—to ensure that the Federal Government operates with its eyes wide open and not with ideological blinders, simply because we don't want to see the truth of what is occurring with regard to climate change.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I have long been concerned with how EPA conducts its cost-benefit analysis to justify its rulemaking. This is something that the committee has discussed with EPA on a number of occasions, and the Supreme Court recently ruled that EPA's approach to examining costs and their regulation was flawed.

The administration's revised estimates for the social cost of carbon help justify on paper larger benefits from reducing carbon emissions in any proposed rule. If the administration can inflate the price tag so that the benefits always exceed the costs, the administration can goldplate requirement regulations from any department or any agency.

Section 437 says that the administration should convene a working group to revise the estimates in a more transparent manner and to make that information available to the public.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment addresses is not simply the creation of some commission or a nuanced look into how cost-benefit analyses are done. It actually would ensure that the costs of climate change are able to be considered in decisionmaking.

The answer to the concerns that my colleague raised from the other side would be a surgical approach, not to remove the authority to look at the cost of climate change, which is what this language does and what my amendment would fix.

This rider is really about the deep ideologically driven agenda of climate deniers and is a terrible waste of both Federal and taxpayer money to allow its passage because it will lead to poor decisionmaking by the Federal Government.

Companies are planning for climate change. Municipalities and States are planning for climate change. We need to look at the monetized costs with regard to climate change of new rules and regulations.

Instead of spending our time here focusing on how to impact and better understand climate change, we have this opportunity to ensure that that is a factor in future decisionmaking, rather than prohibiting agencies from even considering it in the cost of climate change.

Blocking proposals and silencing discussion isn't indicative of leadership, Mr. Chair. It is indicative of fear of the truth.

I urge my colleagues to consider that and support my and my colleague's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, I would rise in opposition to this amendment.

I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 438. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose, promulgate, implement, administer, or enforce a national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone that is lower than the standard established under section 50.15 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on July 2, 2014), until at least 85 percent of the counties that were nonattainment areas under that standard as of July 2, 2014, achieve full compliance with that standard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, beginning on line 9, strike '', until at least 85 percent of the counties that were nonattainment areas under that standard as of July 2, 2014, achieve full compliance with that standard''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT, along with the ranking member, for the work he and the committee have done.

My amendment prevents the EPA from using any funds in the bill to change ozone regulations, regardless of whether or not all counties meet the 2008 standards.

As of 2012 and based on the 2008 ozone standards as designated by the EPA, 24 mainland States were in attainment, including my home State of Florida. An additional four States had either partial attainment or whole counties had marginal attainment.

What I find most interesting is the areas of our Nation that have consistently been designated as nonattainment by the EPA. This includes most of California, parts of Texas, and the mid-Atlantic States. These counties have had nearly 20 years to change their policies and abide by the ozone standards.

Under the newly proposed standards, a fair amount of the country would be designated as nonattainment areas. Why should the remainder of the country be subject to new standards when parts of the country have yet to meet the 2008 or even 2009 standards?

Making this change will have serious economic implications on the States and counties that have already proactively worked to reduce their emissions, all at a time when the Nation is still recovering from one of the worst economic recessions of our lifetime.

Furthermore, I would like to remind my colleagues of the recent Supreme Court decision, Michigan, et al., v. Environmental Protection Agency. At the heart of the case was whether or not the EPA took care to include the potential cost to power plants when proposing new regulations, and that estimated cost is $9.6 billion and a burden on the American taxpayers. The Supreme Court held that the EPA interpreted U.S. Code 7412 ''unreasonably when it deemed cost irrelevant to the decision.''

I would like to say that this is the exception and not the rule when it comes to the EPA, but that simply is not the truth. The EPA has made its de facto policy to implement unreasonable regulations with no regard to the larger impact it will have on the economy and taxpayers and the environment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment would reverse section 438 to block the EPA from making critical updates to its ozone standard. The amendment makes an already bad policy rider in this bill even worse.

This amendment, however, would completely prohibit the EPA from updating the standard, short-circuiting both current law and the judicial process, while putting millions of Americans' health at risk.

Ozone is the main component in smog, and it has been scientifically proven to aggravate lung disease, increase frequency and severity of asthma attacks, and reduce lung function.

We hear about those opportunities all the time that we are given now when the ozone is too high in the air to stay inside. Young children shouldn't be out, and people with heart disease and lung disease should stay indoors.

The Clean Air Act requires the EPA to review its ozone standard every 5 years to reflect the most up-to-date science on ozone and its impacts on public health.

The EPA, in fact, is under a court order to issue its final rules by October of this year. The EPA's update to its ozone standard is based on strong scientific evidence, including over 1,000 scientific studies that show the harmful effect of ozone on human health and the need for higher standards.

The EPA estimates the benefit of updated standards of 70 parts per billion will yield the health benefits of $13 billion each year.

On its merits, this amendment is shortsighted and reactionary, and it is a backdoor amendment to completely gut the Clean Air Act.

Prohibiting the EPA's ability to update ozone standards is reckless, and it is out of touch with what Americans want, and that is clear air. The EPA's update is firmly rooted in science and ensures health and protections for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, ozone comes from many different sources. Yes, it is true that it comes from hydrocarbons. When the UV light hits it, it does do that. It also comes from the oceans. It comes from the swamps. It comes from just nature itself.

Ozone by itself is not always bad because it is used industrially. It disinfects laundry. It disinfects water in place of chlorine. It deodorizes the air. It kills bacteria on food and contact surfaces. It sanitizes swimming pools. The list goes on and on and on.

Yes, there have been reports of it causing respiratory problems, but that is also associated with spores and molds and things like that.

I think ozone, at this time—especially when you look at the rulings from 1997 and 2008, those standards—I don't think we should move forward at this time, with our Nation in the economic recovery, to put new standards on all of the Nation when yet a large portion of the Nation is still not under compliance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I probably live in the most regulated air quality area in the United States, southern California.

In southern California, our population continues to grow; yet we have been able to make significant air quality improvements within the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

The committee set a level at 85 percent of the communities so that the marginal nonattainment communities could have the opportunity to achieve compliance with the 2008 standards before further updates are considered.

This amendment would prevent EPA from lowering the ozone standard below the 2008 levels. This amendment would prevent further updates to the ozone standard for an indefinite and undetermined timeframe, and that is certainly not the committee's intent.

We need to make progress in clean air in areas that folks want to see cleaner air, but at the same time making sure that technology is there in order to do that. This was, I think, compromise language that the underlying bill has that works to move us forward, but at the same time not stopping us from obtaining cleaner air in the future.

I am in opposition to this amendment.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that ozone is incriminated a lot of times when I think

we ought to look at particulate matter in dusty environments or in urban areas where airflow in apartment buildings may not be like it should be.

Ozone is used as an alternative to chlorine for bleaching wood, paper products, and things like that. Many hospitals around the world use large ozone generators to decontaminate operating rooms between surgeries. It is used in industry all the time.

I just ask people to support this amendment, so we don't have more overreaching regulations from the EPA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the EPA's update is firmly rooted in science and ensures the health and protections for the American people. We have a responsibility to protect the millions of Americans affected by ozone pollution.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. YOHO. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike section 438.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Maryland and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to strike section 438.

Section 438 would prohibit any funds in this Act from being used to even propose a national ozone standard that is less than that currently in law until at least 85 percent of the counties across the country that do not currently meet that standard achieve full compliance.

Now, the current ozone standard under title 40 is 75 parts per billion; but, Mr. Chair, we had a series of hearings in our House Science Committee earlier this year where we heard strong testimony from scientists at State pollution control agencies and physicians at hospitals all telling us that the current standard is not in line with the current science.

The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee declared as far back as 2008 that they believe that the current standard of 75 parts per billion is insufficient to protect public health. In fact, right now, the ozone standard can mislead people to believe that the air, in fact, is safe to breathe when it is not.

Studies conducted by the American Lung Association have shown more than 4 out of every 10 people in the United States live in places where ozone levels often make it dangerous to breathe.

The current standard rates, what we now know to be very dangerous air quality, as code yellow or moderate. This can lead those who are particularly at risk of ozone-related illness, such as children and senior citizens, to unwittingly be exposed to harmful levels of ozone. This has the potential to impact millions of people in every State across the Nation.

Just look at my own home State of Maryland. There are 145,000 children with pediatric asthma. Over 430,000 adults have asthma. Mr. Chairman, 246,000 people in my State have chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or COPD, and 367,000 people in our State have cardiovascular disease that is related to ozone.

The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee recommends that, in order to protect the public health, the EPA set the primary ozone standard between 60 and 70 parts per billion. In November of last year, the EPA did exactly what it is supposed to do.

It looked at the strong scientific evidence showing the health risks of ozone, and it issued a proposed rule to lower the ozone standard from 75 parts per billion to a standard within the range of 65 to 70 parts per billion.

□ 1615

Setting that standard begins a 2-year process designed to identify areas with too much ozone. Once those areas are identified, State and local governments can craft plans tailored to their areas using cost-effective approaches.

This new standard, based on the most current science, will help to provide a framework for these plans, which, in turn, will help our States continue along the path to clean air. And yet, here we are, and this provision that I am providing to strike would stop the EPA from even proposing a standard of 70 parts per billion.

This is the responsibility of the EPA. This new standard would protect Americans' health and our environment. In addition, an analysis conducted by the EPA shows that, though the annual cost of the proposed standard of 70 parts per billion might be around $3.9 billion, the health benefits are estimated to reach between $6.4 billion and $13 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, ground level ozone is harmful to the public health. It contributes to asthma attacks, decreased lung function, respiratory infection, and even death. Breathing ozone is dangerous for everyone, but particularly for children, for the elderly and people of all ages who have lung diseases.

We need to allow the EPA—in fact, empower the EPA—to follow the science and create minimum standards necessary to protect public health. I urge my colleagues to protect these vulnerable populations as well as clean air for every American, and vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in clear opposition to this amendment.

The language that was adopted in the full committee was carefully crafted. It simply allows a majority of nonattainment counties to achieve attainment status before the EPA moves the goalposts.

In nonattainment areas, the EPA's proposed ozone standards would stifle economic growth and cost jobs and revenue. Just last week, the Supreme Court admonished the EPA for ignoring the costs of its regulations. The costs involved would be devastating to our economy. Even the EPA admitted it would cost $15 billion a year. Other studies have estimated that costs could be as high as $140 billion a year.

In West Virginia, in my State, it would mean $2 billion in compliance costs, 10,000 lost jobs, and more fees for residents even to operate their vehicles.

It would have significant impacts on agriculture, manufacturing, and the energy industry. Federal highway funds could be frozen and permits for infrastructure could be held up.

I am hopeful that some of our colleagues across the aisle will recognize the impact this will have on each of our districts.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, here we have heard again the exaggerated claims about implementation, so let's get to the facts.

The first fact, the scientists tell us that this is a standard that we need to protect the public health. The second fact, the EPA estimates that the cost might be around $3.9 billion.

But let's look at the health benefits, because those are costing us currently.

The health benefits are estimated to reach between $6.4 and $13 billion, and that means that there is a ripple effect when we invest in making sure that we implement a standard that protects the public health, and it has a benefit on the public health.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is an argument here for the EPA to simply do its job, the job that it was charged to do by taxpayers, and that is to protect the public health, to give us clean air, and to make sure that we have ozone standards that in fact meet our responsibility.

The EPA is doing its job. Let's stop Congress from keeping the EPA from keeping our air clean.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for the time and for including commonsense language in the bill that is now being debated.

In 2008, EPA set a strict ozone rule that was stuck in legal limbo for years. From big cities to small towns, over 200 counties are still in nonattainment.

Yet, before we finish that job, EPA wants to move the goalposts. They have issued new ozone rules that are so strict they can't be achieved with our current technology. All of America will be hit hard with job losses.

This bill simply includes a pause button on new EPA rules until we can finish the job and reach our current mandates.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Edwards amendment and strip this language from this bill.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As mentioned earlier, I live in one of the most, maybe the most, regulated air districts in the United States, and I am a strong advocate for clean air. My district has achieved some of the largest emission reductions in the country.

However, EPA continues to dig the hole deeper as my district continues to try to work its way out of nonattainment. So EPA and the States need to use the resources we provided in the bill to play catch-up on a statutory obligation to help communities implement the 2008 standard.

Remember, just last April, EPA finalized the rule for the 2008 standards. When 85 percent of the communities can achieve the latest standards, then EPA should consider whether or not revisions are necessary.

I will remind my colleagues that the Clean Air Act only directs EPA to review the standards every 5 years. It does not require that EPA revise the standard.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, once again, this is a sincere effort to try to set a benchmark and not have the EPA moving the goalposts that will have such economic devastation, billions of dollars in cost, and I encourage a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 5, strike ''primary or''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, according to the American Lung Association's 2015 State of the Air Report, the Los Angeles metropolitan area, which includes both my district and also the Appropriations Subcommittee chair's district, that metropolitan area is the number one in the country for ozone pollution.

But ozone pollution is not just a southern California problem. The report shows that more than 40 percent of the United States' population lives in areas with unhealthy levels of ozone. Large cities like Houston and less populated areas like northwest Ohio also make the list.

Power plants, motor vehicles, and chemical solvents contribute to the majority of nitrous oxides and volatile organic compounds, NO_X and VOCs, which react with each other on hot, sunny days to produce ground level ozone.

The American Lung Association has pointed out that because hot, sunny days produce the most ozone, climate change is increasing the number of unhealthy ozone level days. We are all familiar with those ''high ozone level'' warnings that happen on really hot, sunny days, and unfortunately, they are becoming more and more common due to global warming.

Ground level ozone interacts with lung tissue, can cause major problems for children, the elderly, and anyone with lung disease. Ozone is known to aggravate health problems such as asthma, and it is also linked to low birth rates, cardiovascular problems, and premature death.

Given the grave consequences and the widespread problem of ozone pollution, I am glad that EPA is moving forward with updates to its national standards for ozone pollution.

Members of the medical and health communities have been calling for a long time for updates of this standard in order to protect the public health. The current standard of 75 parts per billion is outdated and does not adequately protect public health, which is what the EPA is required to do under the Clean Air Act. Thousands of hospital visits and premature deaths and up to a million missed schooldays can be prevented just by strengthening this standard.

But instead of trusting health professionals, some in Congress have decided to protect the financial interests of the polluters. The reckless legislative rider in section 438 of this appropriations bill blocks the EPA from updating or even proposing scientifically-based standards for ozone to the detriment of the health of at least 40 percent of the U.S. population.

I urge my colleagues to vote to remove this polluter protecting section from the bill, to support the Edwards amendment, and allow the EPA to move forward with doing what they are required to do by law, and that is protect the public health.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. JENKINS included the language in the full committee bill that, I think, came to a reasonable compromise. As the gentleman is aware, many communities cannot reach the old standard, the 2008 standard, that is now the law, and so this just gives the communities throughout the country that cannot get to attainment additional time to develop the technologies before we go to a new standard.

I would remind the gentleman that it was just last April that we came to a determination on the 2008 standard, and the administration already is talking about a new standard that most of the Nation cannot reach in the short term. So this gives a brief, little bit of time to allow these communities to improve their technologies and to be able to meet a new standard down the road.

So I would oppose the gentleman's amendment and support the underlying bill.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, let's just talk about why we need to change the standard.

I understand and appreciate that reaching that standard is going to take some work, but remember, the air, by saying that we don't need to do this because the air is cleaner than it was 30 years ago, for example, does nothing to put current air quality in context. Just because the air is cleaner than it used to be doesn't mean that it is completely healthy.

My district is a great example of this. L.A. County has reduced its ground ozone by 5 days since 2009, and I am proud of that, but it doesn't mean our air is healthy. We still experienced 217 days of unhealthy ozone level days last year.

We need to take into account current pollution levels. We need to use the best science available to determine what standards are needed to get our ozone pollution below those unhealthy

levels. That is why we are doing this, to get the ozone below unhealthy levels. That is what EPA is doing, and we shouldn't block their efforts because we think that the air is cleaner or it is difficult to reach.

□ 1630

The savings in public health will far outweigh the costs to polluting industries. If the EPA would implement a standard of just 70 parts per billion, the cost of implementation is estimated to be about $3.9 billion, but the savings in public health costs are estimated to be anywhere from $6.4 to $13 billion. That is a net savings of $2.5 to $9 billion. If you reduce the standard even lower, to 65 parts per billion, the savings are even greater, from $4 to $23 billion in public health costs.

Ground ozone pollution costs billions of dollars in healthcare expenses around the country. We have a chance to save taxpayers a lot of money.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's efforts on trying to clean the ozone out of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. We have to suffer the ozone that is being blown from L.A./Long Beach over into the Inland Empire. Certainly the ports of L.A. and Long Beach, the trains emit a lot of ozone and a lot of pollutants that end up in the Inland Empire, so we want to clean that air up.

As you know, we can't meet the 2008 standards at this time. We are doing everything we can to meet those standards, but until these communities can get the technology to meet the existing standard, we shouldn't impose a new standard that could cause grave economic harm to the communities.

With that, I would say ''no'' to this amendment and move on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

SEC. 439. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled ''Hydraulic Fracturing on Federal and Indian Lands'' as published in the Federal Register on March 26, 2015 and March 30, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 16127 and 16577, respectively).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment on behalf of myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), which I do intend to withdraw.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 14, strike ''or any other''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, the Bureau of Land Management is currently working toward implementation of a rule that would modernize horribly outdated oil and gas regulations on Federal land. My amendment would strike a section of this bill that would halt this important work.

What we have to do is to allow the BLM to proceed with them implementing this rule to provide a national baseline to protect our environment, our water, and our Federal lands from hazardous contamination.

Since the 1980s, the scale and impacts associated with the oil and gas industry have grown dramatically, but BLM's fracking regulations have not kept pace. In March of 2015, the BLM finalized a modest, commonsense rule to update its 30-year-old fracking regulations.

With these updates, the BLM is taking responsible steps to improve well integrity, reduce the impact of toxic wastewater, and increase transparency around chemicals used in the fracking process.

Importantly, these new regulations will not impact States that already have robust fracking regulations and will simply offer a regulatory baseline for the States that do not have current fracking regulations.

Notably, in 2013, there were still 19 States with operating fracking wells that had absolutely no hydraulic fracturing regulations in place.

Right now over 90 percent of the more than 2,500 oil and gas wells drilled every year on federally managed lands use hydraulic fracturing.

Just this month the EPA released a draft report that concludes that there are above- and below-ground mechanisms by which hazardous hydraulic fracturing chemicals have the potential to impact drinking water resources.

Because of this, the Federal Government really has to take the necessary steps to ensure that toxic, cancer-causing fracking chemicals do not contaminate America's water supply, America's streams, America's rivers, and America's lakes.

As many of you know, the fracking fluids injected into oil and gas wells contain thousands of chemicals, many of which can harm humans and the environment.

In fact, the EPA identified over 1,000 different chemicals that have been used during the hydraulic fracturing process, with an estimated 9,100 gallons of chemicals used for each well.

Due in large part to fracking loopholes and outdated oil and gas regulations, fracking chemical spills and water contaminations have occurred.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, for example, there were nearly 600 documented cases of wastewater and chemical spills in 2013 alone.

In fact, the EPA estimates that there are as many as 12 chemical spills for every 100 oil and gas wells in the State of Pennsylvania. And I need to remind the House that there are almost 8,000 active gas wells operating in Pennsylvania right now. So that is a lot of spills.

Chemical and wastewater spills associated with fracking operations harm the environment, and it has been found to contaminate surface water. The EPA's draft study found that 8 percent of studied wastewater spills polluted surface or groundwater.

Thankfully, the BLM's rule will help prevent fracking chemicals and wastewater from contaminating water bodies.

It does so by validating the integrity of fracking wells and increasing the standards for storage and recovery of waste fluid. This rule will require companies publicly to disclose the chemicals being pumped into public lands.

While I am concerned that the BLM fracking rule does not go far enough in some areas, simply stopping the rule in its tracks is just irresponsible.

I am not opposed to fracking. I believe we have to utilize our natural resources, but we need to do so in a careful and responsible manner.

There are bad actors in the oil and gas business just like there are some bad actors in every area, actors that cut corners and don't drill and frack properly and safely.

The States, unfortunately, don't have all the expertise and resources to properly manage this exploding industry. The rule will set a relatively low bar but one that ensures a baseline across the country to protect our public lands.

I urge you to support my amendment to allow the BLM to implement a rule that will prevent fracking chemical contamination and keep our Nation's water supply pristine and something Americans can be proud of.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 439.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would strike section 439 from the underlying bill. In doing so, this amendment would allow the Bureau of Land Management to implement standards

to support safe and responsible fracking operations on public and Native American lands.

More than 1.5 million public comments were submitted in a transparent process to regulate fracking on 750 million acres of public and Indian lands. More than 100,000 oil and gas wells are situated on these lands.

This amendment will ensure that the BLM's rule is fully implemented so that fracking for oil and gas continues but with full regard to public health and the environment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

And I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I understand the BLM needed to update its regulation related to fracking on Federal and Indian lands. BLM regulations are 25, 30 years old.

However, the States have been doing the same thing over the last number of years. Unfortunately, BLM's rule is duplicative of existing State regulation.

It forces companies to drill into a double compliance scheme. It also costs them more time, and it significantly lengthens the time in which it takes time to get to a permit.

None of this is necessary, which is why we adopted this provision during the committee's markup of this bill.

I certainly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank Chairman CALVERT for his hard work on this section of the appropriations bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. American consumers have benefited from low energy prices, thanks to the American energy revolution and technological advancements in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling.

For decades, hydraulic fracturing has been successfully regulated by the States. In 2013, the House passed on a bipartisan basis legislation which I coauthored with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) from the other side of the aisle, and that legislation would stop the BLM from pursuing duplicative and burdensome hydraulic fracturing regulations.

Unfortunately, the BLM didn't listen to what Congress said, and it continued down a path to impose additional red tape on American energy development and to further drive down energy production on energy lands while State and private production continues to experience record growth in a safe and efficient manner.

This has always been a solution in search of a problem, particularly when the EPA and the Department of Energy have each agreed that hydraulic fracturing is being conducted safely right now.

Even the courts agree that there are problems with the BLM's rules, as evidenced by the recent stay granted by the U.S. District Court of Wyoming to stop the BLM from moving forward with their overreaching regulatory activity.

This amendment is bad for jobs. It would increase energy costs and would limit economic opportunity for hardworking families, particularly those at the bottom end of the income tables. So it hurts those that are struggling to get by today with higher energy costs.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for his work on including this provision during markup, as well as Chairman CALVERT for his support on stopping this regulatory overreach.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment before us would strike the policy rider that prohibits the Bureau of Land Management from implementing a uniform national standard for hydraulic fracking on public lands, on Federal lands.

Such standards are necessary to ensure the operations on public and tribal lands are safe and that they are conducted in an environmentally responsible way. This only affects Federal lands and tribal lands.

Now, of the 32 States with the potential for oil and gas development on federally managed mineral resources, only slightly more than half of them have rules in place that even address hydraulic fracturing, and those that do have rules in place vary greatly in their requirements.

As you can see, there is no consistency in the rules. There is no guarantee that there are good quality rules put in place. And we are talking about making sure that, on Federal leases, on Federal lands, that we have a national standard.

The BLM continues to offer millions of public lands up for renewable energy production, and that is why it is absolutely critical that they have the confidence and the transparency and the safety and environmental protections that are put in place on these Federal lands.

Prior to the issuance of a hydraulic fracturing rule, the BLM rules on oil and gas operation were updated over 30 years ago, 30 years ago. They had not kept pace with the significant technology advancements in hydraulic fracturing techniques and the tremendous increase of its use.

As part of this implementation rule, the BLM office is in the process of meeting with their State counterparts—they are working with them—undertaking a State-by-State comparison of regulatory requirements in order to identify opportunities for variances and to establish memorandums of understanding between the States that will realize efficiencies and allow for successful implementation of the rule. So we should be allowing BLM to coordinate with the States and ensure that hydraulic fracturing activities are being carried out safely and effectively when Federal leases are involved.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

□ 1645

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, my State of Wyoming is the largest onshore producer of oil and gas from Federal land. The reason our Wyoming court stayed the Federal BLM's rules is because Wyoming has been regulating fracking through its oil and gas commission from the beginning. There has never been one documented case of drinking water being contaminated. Furthermore, the way that BLM land lays with private land and State land is they are all interspersed; yet, underground, because of horizontal drilling, the drilling transcends from State land to private land to Federal land, and back and forth. Those wells are unitized so the production can be allocated among the various owners of private, State, and Federal land. You can't have two layers of surfaces State ownership regulation when the drilling is occurring going back and forth among State, private, and Federal lands.

Wyoming has handled its fracking regulations responsibly. It was the first in the Nation to do so. I strongly urge you leave it in the hands of States who do it best.

Mr. CALVERT. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, in response to some of the comments that were never made, I would like to offer five points.

Number one is BLM doesn't have the statutory authority to do the actions that they tried to. The Federal Court was right in granting an injunction. The EPA and the Department of Energy have both said that hydraulic fracturing is safe, and that is evidenced by the safe and efficient production of much more oil and gas on private and State lands while Federal production is going down.

Again, this is a solution in search of a problem. So I would urge all my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say congratulations to the State of Wyoming. That is exactly why we need this amendment. We want those same regulations on a national level. Mr. Chairman, 16 to 17 States have no regulation. Wyoming has gotten it right.

This amendment will ensure that the BLM rule is fully implemented so that

fracking for oil and gas continues, but with full regard to the public health and the environment.

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

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

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 440. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is $0.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE REVISED COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION PLAN FOR THE ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ALASKA

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Revised Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2015 (80 Fed Reg. 4303).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Alaska and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

I want to thank Mr. CALVERT and his committee for the work they have done on this legislation, and I support the underlying bill. The administration has left no alternative to the people of Alaska and to those with an interest in our national energy policy.

This spring, under this President, the Department of the Interior published the management plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to recommend the entirety of the area be designated as wilderness. This would include the 1002 area that was set aside by Congress for potential development in the future, an area that holds 10 billion barrels of oil, at the minimum, and probably 37 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

My amendment would ensure that no funding can be spent implementing this recommendation. The impact of this recommendation should not be overlooked, as the recommendation requires immediate management of the entire area as wilderness—unilaterally undermining the role of Congress through a de facto wilderness designation.

This action violates the Statehood Compact, which was founded on ensuring the development of subsurface resources for the economic well-being of this Nation. This action also violates the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which established more than 100 million acres of conservation areas. And in recognition of the enormity of the acreage being locked up, the act drew a line guaranteeing that no more conservation areas can be created without an act of Congress—our role.

There is no need for additional wilderness areas in ANWR, given 92 percent of the refuge is already closed to development.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska holds 53 percent of Federal wilderness areas in the Nation, and that is not enough for this administration. You think about that a moment. The administration's plan immediately raises another administrative, bureaucratic wall to oil and gas development. This is a betrayal to the Alaskan people and, I believe, to this Nation and to this Congress. This plan by the administration handcuffs my State from providing for itself and pushes us to be more dependent on Federal funds.

This is not just an assault on Alaska. This is another example of executive overreach by this administration undermining the role of Congress. This is our role, not this administration's. I don't care whose administration it is; when the President oversteps his bounds, we should take and accept our responsibility. And this is the law he cannot do, but he says ''I can do it.''

By the way, Mr. Chairman, this was an example, I think, of this whole Department of the Interior. Between EPA and the Department of the Interior, they are trying to cripple this Nation, trying to cripple my State, against the law. This is very specific in ANILCA. If you don't believe me, go back and read it.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by my friend from Alaska would prohibit any Federal funds from being used to implement the administration's revised comprehensive conservation plan to better sustain and manage the entire Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, attaching this rider to the Interior Appropriations bill would be a mistake. The coastal plain of the Arctic refuge is one of the few remaining places in our Nation that remains pristine and undisturbed. It provides critical protection for thousands of species—caribou, polar bear, and gray wolves, just to name a few—and they desperately need this important habitat. Roughly 20 million acres managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are some of the best and last undisturbed natural areas in this Nation.

I understand that the gentleman from Alaska feels strongly about this issue, and he has been a great advocate for his State for decades; but on this important issue, we deeply disagree.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, the Interior Department released an updated conservation plan to better manage the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and the President took that opportunity to call on Congress to pass legislation designating the coastal plain as a wilderness, an even greater level of protection for this incredible area. The protected area encompasses a wide range of Arctic and subarctic ecosystems. There are unadulterated landforms, and there are native flora and fauna. The refuge has an incredible biological integrity, natural diversity, and environmental health.

I understand that there are differences of opinion how to manage this land and that legislation designated in this area as wilderness may not get very far in this Congress. But I want to commend the President for his leadership on this issue, and I would hope that the legislative process could play out and that we not adopt this rider onto this bill because this issue is just far too important.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not point out one more obvious truth: the President will not sign a bill loaded up with antienvironmental riders just like this one. So we only make the path for the bill harder by including it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I appreciate the comments from the gentlewoman.

I would suggest, respectfully, we should follow the law. We have given up the responsibility in this Congress to the President—not just this President, other Presidents. It is clear in the law nothing more than 5,000 acres can be withdrawn and put in the wilderness, without the okay of the Congress, in Alaska. No more clause. It stands for no more.

Now, we have a President that says ''up yours'' to the Congress. That is not the way to run this business. We have a responsibility as Congressmen to do our job. And when he goes against the law through executive order, that is against this Constitution of America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly would urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment, and I support his amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13007, entitled ''Indian Sacred Sites''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would ensure that cultural and sacred sites of Indian and Alaska Native tribes are protected by mandating that none of the funds in this bill can be used in contravention of Executive Order 13007.

Executive Order 13007, issued by President Clinton in 1996, requires Federal agencies to accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites and, more importantly, to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites.

Far too often, Indian sacred sites are an afterthought during the Federal Government land management process. When negotiating land swaps and when constructing other management decisions, the voice of Indian Country with regard to sacred sites is ignored. But this is not just land to the Native people. These are cultural and spiritual areas that are part of the tribe's history and its living legacy. These are places where their ancestors lived, prayed, hunted, gathered, fought, and died. They are part and parcel of tribal identity, and it is our duty to ensure they are preserved and protected.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The Department of the Interior tells me they are already in compliance with the executive order. There is no question that providing Indian tribes with access to their sacred sites is the right thing to do, so I would be more than happy to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman's amendment will ensure that this important executive order is respected in such a way that it has my wholehearted support in protecting the liberty and religious rights of Native American Indians.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, 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. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 63.7570(b)(2) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Maine and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, Maine is home to the most skilled paper makers in the world. Our hardworking men and women manufacture paper products that we use every day. Our paper makers are also some of the best stewards of the environment. They know that we need healthy forests to make the high quality wood products sold around the globe.

□ 1700

When trees are harvested to make paper, the branches and the bark can be left behind to be decomposed; or they can be burned to generate energy to run the machinery to make paper.

Either way, the carbon from this biomass is returned to the environment as part of the natural carbon cycle. What a great idea—instead of ending up in a landfill, this green, renewable energy fuels our economy and creates jobs.

Now, our Sappi paper mill in Skowhegan, Maine, burns biomass to make some of the finest quality paper in the world. In doing so, it directly employs 800 hard-working Mainers. In addition, loggers and truckers who produce and transport this biomass also earn paychecks for their families.

Unfortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency is attacking this renewable method to power our businesses and to create jobs. All of us who have sat around a campfire have seen that wet wood, branches, and grass emit a darker smoke. However, the same carbon is being recycled through the environment. It is just a slightly different color.

The EPA wants to impose stricter emission standards on companies that burn wet wood, branches, and bark instead of dumping them into a landfill. That just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, the EPA is trying to force our Skowhegan mill to spend millions of additional dollars on special smokestack equipment because wet biomass burns darker. The mill owners have worked diligently with the regional EPA office in Boston and the Maine Department of Environmental Protection to put in place a commonsense emissions monitoring system that reflects the burning of biomass. Sadly, the EPA headquarters right here in Washington rejected their sensible solution.

Mr. Chairman, this is not fair, and this is not right. Those 800 hard-working paper makers at the Sappi mill deserve an EPA that works for them, not against them.

Now, our paper mill in Maine could very well be a different mill in Michigan, Minnesota, or Georgia that also uses green American biomass energy.

America should keep her energy dollars and jobs here at home and not ship them to the Middle East. Our businesses need that energy to keep our manufacturing jobs right here in America and not send them to China. This is a national security issue, as well as a jobs issue, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my House Republicans and Democrats today to support my simple, commonsense bill. Passing it will stop the EPA from unfairly penalizing employers who use green, renewable American biomass energy.

My amendment prohibits the EPA from reaching beyond some of the biomass emission rules already being enforced by the regional EPA offices and the State environmental authorities.

Let's show the American people today that Congress supports a domestic energy source that is good for the environment, creates jobs, and keeps us safer here at home

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIQUIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I suspect this issue is not just limited to your State, and I hope this language will help bring EPA to the table so that everyone can find a path forward for this issue that is important for the country.

Certainly, I have no objection to this amendment. In fact, I support it.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

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

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, it is a blanket block to the EPA from fully implementing and enforcing air toxic standards for boilers and incinerators.

Among other things, there are boilers that burn natural gas, coal, wood, oil, and other fuel to produce steam, and the steam does produce electricity or provide heat, and incinerators burn waste to dispose of it. These boilers and incinerators have the potential of releasing very toxic pollutants such as mercury, lead, dioxin, and other pollutants that are linked to health effects.

In 2011, after a robust public process, including three public hearings and responding to thousands of public comments, the EPA finalized standards to reduce toxic emissions for existing new boilers and commercial industrial solid waste incinerators and sewage sludge incinerators.

Now, among other things, the rule requires emissions to just meet certain standards. It is a measurement of air pollution based on the degree of which light is blocked by the pollutant from the smokestack.

The rule also allows the EPA to approve alternative opacity limits under certain circumstances, so there is flexibility within the rule.

Now, the local paper mills in the representative State are exceeding or they are expected to exceed the standard in the EPA's final rule, so to better fit their circumstances, they want an alternate opinion. That is the issue that the EPA is looking at right now. The EPA is looking at this right now. They heard the concerns; they are looking at it.

Strangely, this amendment would not really address that issue. Instead, it would block the EPA from ever approving an alternative limit or implementing or enforcing an alternative limit that had already been improved.

I rise because this amendment, unfortunately, just does not make any sense to me that we would not keep the dialogue moving forward. The EPA has the responsibility of making sure that standards of emissions with mercury and lead and other toxic pollutants are not dangerous to public health, especially to children. We know statistically now that up to 8,100 premature deaths, 5,100 heart attacks, and 52 asthma attacks are all worked into reducing the emissions, to lower those numbers.

We need to stand with the EPA air toxic standards and allow them to achieve their intended benefits and to work with industry where it makes sense, and we can have industry move forward but still protect the public health, just not scrap the parts that industry dislikes.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because it would keep the EPA from doing what it is doing right now, and that is to work with industry, oddly enough, to create a win-win for industry and a win-win for public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I would strongly disagree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle.

Those of us or those who have visited our great State know that we have a pristine natural environment. It is part of our brand, Mr. Chairman. It is something that we protect and will continue to protect at all costs.

However, as a freshman legislator, I have been here for 6 months, and what I have learned in those 6 months is that we have almost a fourth branch of government, and that is these regulators that regulate every part of our life, whether we are trying to make paper or what have you and trying to provide work for our families.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 102(a)(1) of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(1)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, with this amendment, this body has the opportunity to say loudly and clearly: Let's keep our public lands public.

Public lands are a massive economic generator and are important to our health and welfare as Americans. They are beautiful, and they are healing. I recently got to hear from a veteran in Eagle County, and part of his recovery process is the time he spends outdoors on our public lands. They are also practical. They help ensure for water quality and maintain the critical aspects of rural life like farming, ranching, grazing, and logging.

Public lands are where our hunters and fishermen go to enjoy the outdoors. They are where skiers, hikers, bikers, and motorists experience activities that are impossible in other places and are invaluable to their quality of life.

Outdoor enthusiasts utilize those areas. It is a vast economic driver as well. In fact, over $646 billion is generated economically through our public lands, and visiting our public lands supports over 6 million jobs, including many in my district and many in our great State of Colorado.

When recently polled across six western States, the American people said with 96 percent support—with unheard of levels of support—that protecting public lands for future generations is one of their top priorities and that, above and apart from any other, they see the maintenance for access of outdoor activities on our public lands as a critical focus of our Federal Government.

States don't have the resources or expertise to suddenly take on the responsibilities for our Federal lands, nor do State governments even want that authority, Mr. Chairman.

Selling these lands outright to private owners or purveyors would undoubtedly lead to loss of access to these majestic, treasured spaces and, at the same time, would destroy jobs across the West and other areas that are blessed to have public lands; yet there has been attempt after attempt to transfer our most precious public spaces to the States or to private ownership or to sell them at wholesale.

Mr. Chairman, the sportsmen don't want this. The hikers, bikers, campers, skiers, and motorized activists that make up the areas surrounding those held by the Federal Government do not want their land taken away—our land taken away.

Those concerned with environmental well-being, water quality, and public health that depends on the stewardship of our public lands do not want our public lands taken away.

It is lost to me, Mr. Chairman—and perhaps my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can speak to this—exactly who is impacted by and who does touch and enjoy and rely on our public lands and actually does want to see them taken away.

I would pose this inquiry, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this would just make it difficult and impossible for Federal agencies to dispose or willingly or equitably exchange or convey lands to States, local governments, private landowners, and others.

I just may point out the Federal Government currently can't manage its existing land, which is over 640 million acres or approximately 3 out of every 10 acres in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, all my amendment does is ensure that none of the funds made available to this act can be used in contravention to the law of the land. My amendment wouldn't do anything to undermine current authority of congressionally and administratively driven land exchanges. In fact, I brought several before this body and have seen several signed into law.

My district is 62 percent Federal land, and we always have various exchanges, purchases, and sales. Of course, those are consistent with the law, which allows the funds to be used under this bill.

I am a strong believer in the ability of our Federal Government and Congress to make choices wisely in a thorough public and transparent process, which we do in this body.

What my amendment would do instead is prohibit the use of funds in this bill to pursue any additional extra legal ways to turn our Federal land over to private owners. It would prohibit Federal dollars from being used to support, for instance, a commission around finding avenues to turn all Federal lands over to private ownership.

These kinds of ventures are fiscally wasteful and counterproductive and wholly unwanted by the American people who rely and derive spiritual support, health, and jobs from our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to reflect upon who exactly we are working for and what our goal is with regard to our public lands.

I strongly support ensuring that all the provisions of this appropriations bill are limited to the full pursuit of section 102(a)(1) of Public Law 94–579 with regard to our public lands and that none of this money, which is what this amendment will do, can be diverted to privatize our public lands.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT THE SONORAN DESERT TORTOISE AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES OR THREATENED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to treat the Sonoran desert tortoise as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment to the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

My amendment will protect education, grazing, agriculture, energy, housing interests, as well as assist with preventing dangerous wildfires by blocking the Fish and Wildlife Service from listing the Sonoran desert tortoise as an endangered or threatened species. A listing decision for the Sonoran desert tortoise is expected this fiscal year.

Of the potential 26.8 million acres that will likely be designated for critical habitat due to such a listing, 15 million acres are located in the United States, and nearly 4.5 million acres are State trust land.

State trust land revenues, which are currently enjoyed by 13 beneficiaries, of which K–12 education is the largest proportional share of those moneys, will be severely impacted.

If the Sonoran desert tortoise is listed, these acres of trust land will become less valuable for investment as they are burdened with a federal regulatory nexus. Without this amendment, schools that have already undergone significant budget cuts will see even less money flowing into their educational coffers.

The Sonoran desert tortoise is also of substantial concern to many different types of industry, as its habitat falls within urban development corridors as well as on rural and agricultural landscapes.

Listing the species as threatened or endangered will negatively impact commercial, housing and energy developers as well as the agriculture and grazing industries.

Specifically, a listing would be detrimental for 273 different grazing allotments and would jeopardize nearly 6 million acres used for livestock grazing.

Mining will also suffer, as the BLM listed 9,675 new mining claims from 1990 to 2002, 36 percent of which fall within the Sonoran desert tortoise's habitat.

Any ground and vegetation-disturbing activities, including fire suppression activities and restorative treatments, would also be negatively impacted by a listing decision for the species.

Solar energy would also likely be harmed, as large solar projects on desert floors are considered a potential threat to the Sonoran desert tortoise.

My amendment will also encourage significant voluntary efforts and financial contributions for the Sonoran desert tortoise to continue, many of which are already underway at the local level.

Important local conservation efforts began for the species in 2010, and a Candidate Conservation Agreement was recently signed by 15 different agencies in February.

Should the Sonoran desert tortoise become listed, these voluntary efforts and moneys will dissipate as local property owners, ranchers, and developers will no longer have any incentive to work with the Federal and State wildlife management agencies on conservation efforts for the species.

My amendment is supported by the Public Lands Council, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Americans for Limited Government, the Arizona Cattlemen's Association, the Arizona Farm Bureau, the Arizona Mining Association, the Home Builders Association of Central Arizona, and numerous other organizations that are strongly opposed to this listing.

I thank the chair and the ranking member for their tireless efforts to produce this bill.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would do two things. First, it would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from treating the Sonoran desert tortoise as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Secondly, it would restrict the Service from offering any of the critical protections to preserve the species.

The Sonoran desert tortoise is an iconic species. It has been part of the Sonoran Desert ecosystem for over 150,000 years. In 2010, the Fish and Wildlife Service found that the listing for the Sonoran desert tortoise was warranted, but it was precluded because it needed to address other higher priorities.

So last December the Service announced that it was working on a proposed listing determination that is expected to be published within the year.

This amendment, if it were to pass, would stop the Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts and block the Service from meeting a court-ordered deadline to make this listing determination. In other words, they would put the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at odds with what the court has requested them to do. This amendment has no place in the appropriations process, nor does it have any place in this legislative process.

Let's just think about the Endangered Species Act for a minute. It has been one of our most effective and important environmental laws, and it is supported by over 85 percent of Americans.

There has been no law that has been more important in preventing the extinction of wildlife, but some Members of this body seem determined to undermine the law by placing harmful policy riders on this bill.

From my count, as of right now, there are at least 10 species that are at risk of losing the Endangered Species Act protections in this bill.

What type of conservation legacy are we leaving for future generations? That is why I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the Sonoran desert tortoise is part of a

growing problem involving large settlements with the environmental groups who sue the Fish and Wildlife Service's regulatory protections with regard to a large number of different wildlife and plant species.

These multi-district litigation settlements, commonly known as ''sue and settle tactics,'' force the Fish and Wildlife Service to make listing decisions on several hundred species, often with little or no scientific data supporting these listings and without public input to this process.

This possible listing is a result of a lawsuit filed by a few special interest groups aimed at stifling development and has nothing to do with the tortoise.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE SPECIFIC SECTIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 117, 121, or 122 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which I offer with Mr. BEYER of Virginia, would strike three policy riders related to the Endangered Species Act from the underlying bill, those concerning the greater sage-grouse, the northern long-eared bat, and the gray wolf. I want to focus my remarks on the greater sage-grouse.

The language in this bill that seeks to block an Endangered Species Act listing of the bird is unnecessary and is completely inappropriate, putting both the species and the historic quintessentially American sagebrush steppe landscape at risk.

In 1901, Mark Twain described the sagebrush steppe as a ''forest in exquisite miniature.'' At one point, as many as 16 million greater sage-grouse called the sagebrush sea home. Settlers traveling west said that flocks of sage-grouse ''blackened the sky.'' Today the population has been reduced to as few as 200,000 birds.

Right now there are unprecedented and proactive partnerships throughout the West which are working to conserve sagebrush habitat, to encourage predictability for economic development, and to prevent the listing of the greater sage-grouse as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

Federal agencies, States, sportsmen, ranchers, farmers, and conservationists have all come together in this effort. In fact, the 10 land management plans released by the Interior Department last month are based on plans developed by the States, not one size fits all, but individual plans to suit each State's individual needs. This is all the result of a concerted collaboration.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and the States themselves agree that, as long as these partnerships continue, it is likely that the greater sage-grouse will not be listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

Rather than helping communities, the rider in this bill creates uncertainty and only undermines the immense coordinated progress already underway. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I will talk about the three different provisions to this amendment. Let me first talk about the sage-grouse.

The sage-grouse provision in this bill is meant to give the Fish and Wildlife Service time to make a determination of whether there ought to be a listing or not. The court has ordered them to make a determination by, I think, September 30. We are trying to give them the time necessary.

This is going to affect 11 Western States. It is not going to affect Massachusetts, by the way, but it is going to affect 11 Western States substantially.

They have recently put out their resource management plans to the States. There is a period in which the States have a chance to interact with the Federal agency and raise their complaints and so forth about what the problems are with their resource management plans.

We are trying to give the Fish and Wildlife Service and the States—the 11 Western States, by the way, not Massachusetts—the time to come up with a plan so that we don't list this bird.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and the States—everybody, essentially—agree we don't want sage-grouse listed. The States have made incredible progress and have made incredible sacrifices.

The State of Wyoming has taken, I want to say, millions of acres which have potential resources off the table in order to protect the sage-grouse. So we have taken extraordinary efforts to make sure that we don't list this bird.

As far as the wolves are concerned, the fact is that the Fish and Wildlife Service delisted the wolves. It was not us. We didn't want to go against science. We are not going against science. We aren't trying to make any species become extinct.

It was the Fish and Wildlife Service in their use of science that delisted the wolves. But guess what. Some people weren't happy with that; so, they took them to court. And now we are in a court case. The same thing happened in Idaho and in Montana.

This language doesn't take a species off the endangered species list. Some people think we are trying to delist species, and we are not. We are going back to the decision made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to delist the wolves in the Great Lakes and in the State of Wyoming.

I think, if you want to talk about the cost and if you want to complain about what is going on here, you really ought to complain to the plaintiffs who are causing all of this hassle with wolves when the States have done exactly what they were supposed to do.

The wolf populations in the Great Lakes particularly have exploded. In Idaho and Montana, they have exploded. In Wyoming, they have exploded. That is why the Fish and Wildlife Service delisted them.

This amendment is contrary to every bit of science that there is that deals with endangered species. So I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment even though it doesn't affect Massachusetts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first comment that Massachusetts, at one time, was home to the Heath Hen, which is the greater sage-grouse's cousin.

Because at that time we did not have an Endangered Species Act, that Heath Hen is now, unfortunately, extinct. So we have learned an important lesson about the great role the Endangered Species Act does play to protect some of our remarkable species.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my colleague.

Mr. BEYER. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, despite what you may hear from some Members of Congress, gray wolves have not recovered. In a test by the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove them from the Endangered Species Act, protections for wolves have failed time and again.

Why? It is because scientific experts have shown and the courts have confirmed that the best available science does not justify the removal of all ESA protections for gray wolves at this time.

In fact, the only instance in which wolves have been delisted has been through the unprecedented and unfortunate congressional action in 2011 to remove protections from wolves in the Northern Rocky Mountains.

These wolves are now endlessly persecuted by hunters and ranchers despite the positive effects they have on the ecosystem and the minimal toll they take on livestock.

□ 1730

Wolf-related tourism around Yellowstone generates more than $35 million annually for local economies, and recovery in the Pacific Northwest is only beginning.

This amendment would prevent Congress from directing the Fish and Wildlife Service to reissue the delisting of wolves in the western Great Lakes and Wyoming. Now is not the time for Congress to declare open season on one of America's most iconic wild animals. Science, not politics, should guide these delisting decisions.

By the way, wolves are not in Massachusetts, they are not in Virginia, and they never will be as long as we do not continue our efforts to protect wolves and allow them to occupy the old territories they did a few hundred years ago.

This amendment would also allow the Fish and Wildlife Service to move forward with steps to protect the northern long-eared bat. Over the past decade, populations of the bat have declined 98 percent, mostly because of the deadly effects of white-nose syndrome. As a result, Fish and Wildlife Service recently listed the bat as a threatened species. While scientists and wildlife managers work to fight the spread of white-nose syndrome, it is important to ensure that the remaining bat populations are safe from other threats.

The interim rule currently in effect governing taking of the bat is incredibly flexible and was developed in close coordination with industry stakeholders, particularly the timber industry, to ensure that economic activity is not negatively impacted.

The final rule is expected to be similarly flexible. The language in this bill will only serve as a delay tactic, causing additional uncertainty for businesses and property owners, and this amendment would effectively strike these unnecessary sections from the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I do have some gray wolves in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and other places that we will be happy to ship to you if you like. In fact, we didn't have any in Idaho until Fish and Wildlife Service decided that they were going to reintroduce them in Idaho.

When you say the minimal take that it has on cattle, wildlife, and other types of things, there were gray wolves in Idaho that one sheep rancher lost over 300 head of sheep in one night to some wolves. That ends his business, essentially. So it is not a minimal take. If you look at the calf-to-cow ratio of elk and deer in Idaho, the numbers have been down substantially, particularly with elk because, guess what, they like elk, even though we were told that they will go after deer and not elk. Wolves, I guess, like elk better than they do deer.

The gentleman says we need to depend on science, not Congress. Congress never delisted a species. We didn't delist the gray wolves in Idaho and Montana. It was the Fish and Wildlife Service using science. When you say the gray wolves have not recovered, where is your science? Where do you get that? Where does that statement come from? Fish and Wildlife Service that has done the investigations said yes, they have. So do we just not trust them?

It is you people proposing this amendment that are going against science. We are just trying to make sure that the science is protected, and politics doesn't enter. We appreciate the people of Virginia and the people of Massachusetts trying to make sure that the wolves are healthy in Idaho. I can guarantee you they are. They are not persecuted, as you said. Yes, they are hunted, but anybody who believed we were going to introduce wolves into Idaho or Montana where they hadn't been for a number of years and you weren't going to have to maintain population controls of them was living in a fantasyland.

Yes, we do have hunting seasons for wolves, as we do almost all species, but we have to maintain a certain population, and if that population isn't maintained, guess what. Fish and Wildlife takes over, and they go back on the endangered list. So it is not Congress that is making these decisions. It is Fish and Wildlife Service.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that the riders in the underlying bill will do nothing to help our native species but, instead, only serve to cause uncertainty and delay, undermining all the concerted effort by many stakeholders, all seeking to avoid a listing, particularly with the sage-grouse.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the United Nations Environment Programme.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer one final amendment to the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The amendment is simple. It prohibits the EPA from providing funding to the United Nations Environment Programme. The United Nations Environment Programme, or UNEP—I would call it inept—has a history of taking unusual and extreme policy positions, including advocating for population control.

The United Nations is typically funded in the State Department's budget under contributions to international organizations, or CIL. The funds appropriated by this act are meant to be used domestically, not as a slush fund to give to programs at the United Nations.

I will quickly highlight some of the names of the UNEP initiatives that the EPA spent millions of dollars on. One is to promote environmental sound management worldwide. Another one is UNEP Regional Program, Climate Benefits, Asia Pacific. There is even one called Russian Federation Support to the National Program of Action for the Protection of the Arctic. This last one is money that goes specifically to the Russian cause.

I will read from the EPA's own Web site the description of this program:

> This project centers on protection of the Arctic environment in Russia.
>
> This work will cover three broad areas:
>
> Number one, implementation of Russia's national plan of action for protection of the Arctic marine environment from anthropogenic pollution;
>
> Number two, hazardous chemical management;
>
> And, three, climate change mitigation adaptation and awareness.

So let me get this straight. In addition to the billions we contribute to the United Nations through the CIO account, the EPA is funneling millions of tax dollars to this United Nations program, which then gives the money to Russia, who then uses it to implement a Russian national plan and for climate change mitigation, adaptation, and awareness.

U.S. taxpayers, do I need to say anything further why we need to stop this? Let's keep the United States Environmental Protection Agency focused on issues within the United States. Our favorite out-of-control agency need not be concerned with the Asia-Pacific region or with Russia.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this commonsense amendment that is endorsed by the Americans for Limited Government, the Eagle Forum, the Taxpayers Protection Alliance, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and the Yavapai County Board of Supervisors.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their tireless efforts in producing this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit any agency from using funds for the United Nations Environment Programme. Funds for the U.N. are primarily provided through the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee. The EPA administers about $500,000 of international grants, not the millions or the billions that were referred to in this particular bill. So I strongly oppose the amendment.

I understand, as I said earlier, there is a small amount of funding administered for the U.N. Environment Programme in this bill. The primary source of funding for the international programs, I want to stress again, is in the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs bill, not this bill.

So this amendment seeks to solve a problem that really doesn't exist in this bill, but jurisdictional questions aside, we must be an international partner with respect to the environment. Engagement with the international community allows us to share and learn best practices on how to manage toxic substances; international engagement helps set international standards to help our products compete globally; and, more importantly, pollution knows no boundaries. It does not respect international borders.

In the 1970s and 1980s, acid rain was a problem both in the United States and Canada, and through domestic legislation and international work with Canada, we have reduced the amount of acid rain that falls upon the United States and Canada. Now, right now in my home State of Minnesota, we are under a high pollution warning. The culprit is, sadly, a series of forest fires that are raging to the north border of us in Saskatchewan. Now, if we are going to be committed to clean air and clean water on the Canadian-U.S. border, we must be engaged both here at home and abroad.

So as a proud Minnesotan and a proud Member of the United States Congress, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to work together in partnership.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Let's set the record straight. CRS, hardly a partisan effort, since 2003 reports they spent over $6 million in foreign agencies in this very fund. Imagine that. The facts are only convenient when they help us on our side.

If we are going to have a discussion about this, let's put it in the State Department budget and let's talk about it, but let's not hide it in the EPA. Let's keep the EPA's budget and dealings right here in the United States where they belong. They hardly have a track record of success here in the States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress again that, in this bill, there is $500,000. And I would also like to stress, when it comes to regulating waters in the Great Lakes, our tributary rivers and basins on the northern border—and I am sure the same thing, I can't speak with as much eloquence as to what is happening on our southern border—we need to have these international interlocutors. I would appreciate the opportunity for my State and for the Great Lakes States to be able to continue the strong partnership with our Canadian partners.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, with an over $18 trillion debt, when is enough enough? If we are going to talk about foreign expenditures of dollars, let's put it in the State Department budget and make sure we have an open and honest conversation, but it does not belong here. We have to start concentrating on what is important to the United States, not Russia. I guess that is Putin's kind of game is that we clean up his messes for him.

I ask everybody to adopt this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO IVORY

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 120 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, at the inception of the debate and discussion regarding this appropriations bill, I indicated I would offer an amendment to prevent language in the bill from driving the extinction of the African elephants.

I expect the administration to release its proposed ivory rule this month, and it deserves the support of every Member of this Chamber. This rider that is currently in the language of the bill is another unfounded attack on an endangered species that our Nation's top scientific experts have concluded will go extinct without the protection of the Endangered Species Act, under which this rule is being promulgated.

I mentioned in my previous statement the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recently destroyed a one-ton stockpile of illegal elephant ivory, most of it seized in Philadelphia from an antique dealer named Victor Gordon.

Gordon imported and sold ivory from freshly killed African elephants in violation of U.S. law and the laws of the countries where the elephants were poached, and the ivory was stolen. The ivory was doctored so that it looked old enough to pass through a loophole in the law. All of this ivory is illegal. All of it is nearly impossible to distinguish from antique ivory, and anyone who bought it from Gordon and resells it or buys it from a new owner is contributing to the ongoing slaughter of elephants and the criminal trafficking of ivory that supports organized crime and terrorism.

The only way to keep U.S. citizens from being involved in this elephant poaching and trafficking crisis is to eliminate the commercial import, export, and trade of African elephant ivory in our country. Ending the commercial ivory trade will set an example for China and other countries to follow, but they will not act until we do.

□ 1745

Ending the trade will not take away personal possessions, nor will it bar the movement of musical instruments or museum pieces; but to save elephants, we have to eliminate the value of ivory.

Sadly, this rider is just another example of House Republicans driving the extinction of wildlife one species at a time.

Please join me in voting ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's thoughtful comments regarding crisis levels of poaching and wildlife trafficking and the need to do something about it. This is a deadly serious matter with national security implications. That is why this bill has increased funding by $15 million since fiscal year 2013 in order to fight wildlife poachers and traffickers.

Without question, Republicans do not want to see elephants go extinct; but when the Fish and Wildlife Service made the unilateral determination to ban the trade and transport of products containing ivory that have been in the United States legally for years, we heard from orchestra musicians, art museums, wildlife conservation organizations, collectors of fine antiques from chess pieces to pool cues to firearms, and nearly everyone in every organization in between.

They are united in support for elephants, but they are also united in their opposition to new Federal restrictions on products that contain ivory legally obtained. The reality is family heirlooms and rare musical instruments didn't cause the problem, and

the Fish and Wildlife Service should be acknowledging as much.

This bill keeps the status quo, allowing for continued legal trade and transport so that collectors, musicians, and others can get on with their lives until the Fish and Wildlife Service writes a rule that reflects the legitimate concerns of law-abiding U.S. citizens.

The administration is rumored to be just days away from publishing a revised rule to address most of these concerns. If that is the case and if the revised rule solves the problem, then there will be no need for this provision in the final conference report later in the year.

In any case, I remain fully committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find a reasonable solution moving forward. In the meantime, I must oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak in support of Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment. The U.S. is the world's second largest market for ivory. Only China has a greater demand.

In February of last year, President Obama announced a ban on the commercial trade of elephant ivory. This ban is the best way to ensure that U.S. markets do not contribute to the further decline of African elephants in the wild.

The African elephant population has declined by an estimated 50 percent over the last 40 years, with approximately 35,000 elephants poached every year. That amounts to one elephant poached every 15 minutes.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has been undertaking a series of administrative actions, including a proposed rule in order to implement the ban. Section 120 would prevent the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing this rule and other policies necessary to crack down on the domestic illegal ivory market.

I cannot understand why we would not do everything possible to stop the illegal slaughter of African elephants.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment, which would prevent section 120 from being enacted. We must allow the FWS to continue its efforts to prevent the extinction of the African elephant.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to stop the slaughter of African elephants, we need to stop the illegal trade in ivory.

This rider has nothing to do with the unprecedented poaching crisis, and it ignores the impact of the illegal ivory trade within the United States and the way that it is impacting the African elephants' survival.

The rider also undermines the United States' ability to push other countries with significant ivory markets—like China, Vietnam, and Thailand—to take stronger actions to restrict ivory trade.

In fact, according to a recent Washington Post article, China has signaled that its actions to further restrict ivory trade were contingent on what the United States does to regulate our domestic trade.

It is in the national interest of the United States to combat wildlife trafficking and to ensure that we don't contribute to the growing global demand for elephant ivory, which is also funding terrorism around the world.

We need to come up with a responsible set of regulations that protect elephants, while making accommodations to allow certain activities to continue that do not pose a threat to elephants.

I urge my colleagues to support the Grijalva amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. ____. Of the funds provided for ''Environmental Protection Agency—Environmental Programs and Management'', not more than $1,713,500 may be available for the Immediate Office of the Administrator and not more than $3,581,500 may be available for the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations and the aggregate amount otherwise provided under such heading is reduced by $2,735,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment together with my colleagues and fellow committee chairmen, Mr. CONAWAY from Texas and Mr. CHAFFETZ from Utah.

The amendment addresses the Environmental Protection Agency's continuing pattern of obstruction and delay in response to congressional oversight.

Since January 2014, the EPA has proposed or finalized new, far-reaching rules that impact almost every aspect of the American economy. These rules involve major expansions of Federal authority, massive costs to the economy, and are based on secret science that the EPA keeps hidden from external review or scrutiny.

Congress has a constitutional responsibility to perform rigorous oversight of the executive branch. However, as chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, nearly every request for information I make to EPA is greeted with repeated delays, partial responses, or outright refusals to cooperate.

Earlier this year, the committee was forced to issue a subpoena to obtain information related to Administrator Gina McCarthy's deletion of almost 6,000 text messages sent and received on her official Agency mobile device. She claimed that all but one was personal.

Most recently, the committee requested information and documents related to the EPA's development of the waters of the U.S. rule and the Agency's inappropriate lobbying of and collaboration with outside organizations to generate grassroots support.

The EPA again failed to provide the requested documents. The committee was forced to notice its intention to issue a subpoena.

However, producing documents in bits and pieces after months or years of delay are not the actions of an open and transparent administration. They are the actions of an Agency and administration that has something to hide.

It is clear that the EPA does not see its job as facilitating transparency and oversight. It seems to believe its mission is to delay, obstruct, and otherwise attempt to stonewall any attempt by Congress to fulfill its constitutional oversight obligation on behalf of the American people.

Congress should not support such an agency. We are taking further action with this amendment to reduce funding for EPA's offices. The EPA must refocus its efforts on transparency and cooperation with Congress and the American people. At that point, we could consider restoring their funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment clearly is a Republican attempt to cut funding from the Environmental Protection Agency. As an agency that protects the air we all breathe, protects the water we drink, the fish we eat, it means that the EPA works every day to protect the health of every American.

This amendment is clearly an attack against the administration for work that they have been doing to enforce those protections.

It is entirely counterproductive to complain about a lack of timely response from the EPA and then turn around and slash the very funding that allows the EPA Administrator and Agency staff to respond to our concerns.

Crippling cuts to the office of congressional relations will not only make it more difficult for Members of Congress to get our questions answered—and those of our constituents—by slashing the office of intergovernmental agency affairs, this amendment would make it harder for State and local officials to gather the information they need to protect their communities.

I don't really believe we want to tell the EPA that they should cut back on meeting and getting recommendations from local government advisory committees or tell our elected officials at a State level that they are going to have even a harder time getting a hold of someone at the EPA to help them form agreements to address their priority needs.

Our States have a responsibility with the EPA for protecting public health and the environment, and this amendment would undermine those partnerships. This amendment would make it more difficult for the people's representatives at the Federal, State, and local level to reach out and get support and answers from the EPA in order to protect the health of their constituents.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing these cuts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. CONAWAY of Texas for their good work on this.

In the year 2015, five letters were sent to the EPA from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee regarding the waters of the United States rulemaking. All went unanswered until the Science Committee threatened to subpoena.

Probably what is the most egregious and most offensive to us is even when we do bipartisan work—in a bipartisan letter, we asked the EPA to provide a response to a request concerning collections of use of fees and fines—and even when we do it in a bipartisan way, those go unresponded to. They failed to even provide a staff briefing on the collection and use of fines and penalties, despite repeated requests.

We hear on the floor: Well, you can't take away their money, then they won't able to respond.

With the money, they don't respond, so they obviously don't need the money if they are not going to respond—even when we do so in a very professional, bipartisan way, asking legitimate questions about the use of these funds and how this Agency works.

In the year 2013, requests were filed for information regarding actions of a previous Administrator, among other document requests. Responses were inadequate, and a subpoena was filed.

The EPA only began searching for the documents 6 months after a subpoena was issued, 6 months after this happened. This is just not tolerable. There needs to be consequences for this. They obviously don't need these funds if they are going to be so unresponsive even when we do so in a bipartisan way.

I would urge the passage of the Smith amendment. I think it is a good amendment. It is a responsible way to move forward. I appreciate the good work the Appropriations Committee has done in their support and their work. I, again, thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1800

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a new contract or agreement or to administer a portion of an existing contract or agreement with a concessioner, a cooperating association, or any other entity that provides for the sale in any facility within a unit of the National Park System of a non-educational item that depicts a Confederate flag on it.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, that is not the revised amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment?

Mr. HUFFMAN. If it can be substituted with the proper amendment, yes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, you should have the proper amendment now.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a new contract or agreement or to administer a portion of an existing contract or agreement with a concessioner, a cooperating association, or any other entity that provides for the sale in any facility within a unit of the National Park System of an item with a Confederate flag as a stand-alone feature.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the tragic shooting in Charleston, South Carolina, has forced a national conversation about symbols like the Confederate battle flag that represent racism, slavery, and division.

Now, like you, I applaud leaders in South Carolina and other Southern States, both Democrat and Republican, who have called on their States to end the display of the Confederate flag on government property, including State houses and license plates. With the consideration of the Interior Appropriations bill, this House now has an opportunity to add its voice by ending the promotion of the cruel, racist legacy of the Confederacy.

The National Park Service has asked its gift shops, bookstores, and other concessionaires to voluntarily end the sale of standalone items, such as flags, pins, and belt buckles that contain imagery of the Confederate flag. While many concessionaires have agreed to do this, I am dismayed by reports that some will continue to sell items with Confederate flag imagery. This amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill would end these sales. It would prevent the National Park Service from allowing the continued promotion of the Confederacy through these symbols.

Major American retailers like Walmart, Amazon, and eBay are already taking their own steps to ban sales of this type of merchandise, and we now have an obligation to ensure that the Federal agencies that we oversee act with the same moral clarity.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. The language now in this amendment is consistent with the National Park Service policy, and I would support this language as you presently have it drafted. I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment, as Chairman CALVERT pointed out, is consistent with

the recent National Park Service actions to further limit the display of the Confederate flag in units of the National Park system.

Previous National Park Service policy had already provided that the Confederate flag would not be flown alone for many park flagpoles.

On June 25, Park Director Jon Jarvis further requested that the Confederate flag sale items be removed from the National Park bookstores and gift shops. This also follows a decision by several large national retailers, including Walmart, Amazon, and Sears, to stop selling items with Confederate flags on them.

I agree with these decisions and commend those involved for their prompt action.

While in certain and very limited instances it may be appropriate in national parks to display an image of the Confederate flag in its historical context, a general display or sale of Confederate flags is inappropriate and divisive.

I support limiting their use, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce or terminate any of the propagation programs listed in the March, 2013, National Fish Hatchery System Strategic Hatchery and Workforce Planning Report.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that recognizes and supports the important role of fish hatcheries nationwide.

Before I get to the amendment, I want to thank you, Mr. CALVERT, for the hard work of the committee and your recognition of the importance of fish hatcheries already there. I also want to thank my friend from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for cosponsoring this amendment.

My amendment prohibits funds in the bill from being used to reduce or terminate any of the existing propagation programs listed in the March 2013 National Fish Hatchery System Strategic Hatchery and Workforce Planning Report.

This report raised serious concerns that the Fish and Wildlife Service view hatcheries, and particularly mitigation hatcheries, as a low priority program. Personally, I believe that stocking the tailwaters, streams, lakes, and rivers of America should be a higher priority. Hatcheries provide an important service, including providing our Nation's anglers with the recreational enjoyment and opportunities to catch fish; and they can be particularly vital to economic growth in rural areas, including northeast Georgia.

The importance of our Nation's hatcheries is obvious when you look at the Chattahoochee National Forest Fish Hatchery. This hatchery is located back home in Georgia's Ninth Congressional District. It stocks the tailwaters of multiple projects for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority with rainbow trout for the enjoyment of 160,000 anglers per year. Without this facility, the tailwaters would be barren.

The Chattahoochee National Fish Hatchery is a critical economic driver in the quiet mountain town of Suches, Georgia, and the surrounding community. This rural town in Fannin County doesn't have any major stores or banks, but it does have the hatchery. The hatchery has generated over $30 million in total economic input on just $740,000 in investment. It has a $40 return on investment for every dollar spent and provides enjoyment to many, many people.

The Chattahoochee National Fish Hatchery plays an integral role in the sustainability of businesses and communities in northeast Georgia. From providing environmental education and public outreach opportunities to visitors, school groups, and various other organizations to facilitating recreational opportunities, northeast Georgia would not be the same without this facility.

The work at the hatchery in Suches is one example of the importance of propagation programs at national fish hatcheries nationwide. These hatcheries are job creators and economic growth engines. They provide critical services to rural America and play an important educational role. They support anglers with recreational services and responsibly stock the rivers to keep the habitats in order. Despite this, however, the Department of Fish and Wildlife places propagation programs, including those in the Chattahoochee National Fish Hatchery, among the lowest of their funding priorities.

My amendment simply ensures that funds to the Fish and Wildlife Service are consistent with the agency's mission and statutory responsibility.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I want the gentleman from Georgia to know that I support his amendment and would urge its adoption.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CONTRAVENTION OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be expended in contravention of Executive Order 13514 of October 5, 2009 or Executive Order 13653 of November 1, 2013.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

The sum of the harmful consequences of global climate change is the existential crisis of our generation and, perhaps, of our century.

Global temperature changes are already causing prolonged droughts, extreme weather events, and rising sea levels. Tens of millions of people, especially the poorest and the most vulnerable among us, are at risk unless we act to reverse the disastrous effects of climate change.

Our best scientists and our Pope are warning us that unless carbon emissions are dramatically cut, we will see ever rising sea levels, ever more extreme weather, and ever worsening public health, poor air quality, the spread of tropical diseases, lung and heart and heat stress illnesses, and death.

Several weeks ago, the EPA issued a comprehensive report quantifying the economic costs of a changing climate across 20 sectors of the American economy. Among the findings, the report found that, by 2100, mitigating greenhouse global gas emissions could avoid 12,000 deaths per year that are associated with extreme temperatures in just 49 U.S. cities compared to a future with no emission reductions.

The estimated damages to coastal property from sea level rise and storm surge in the contiguous U.S. are $5 trillion through the year 2100 in a future without carbon emissions.

The Department of the Interior also recently released a report revealing that over $40 billion of National Park infrastructure and historic and cultural resources could be at risk due to sea level rise caused by climate change.

Taking acts to address climate change is particularly crucial in urban districts that border waterways, like

mine, where we are already seeing environmental effects. Now is the time when the U.S. should be deepening its commitment to reducing climate change pollution.

Federal agency actions, including those of the agencies named in this bill, have major impacts on our contributions and reactions to global warning. It is imperative, then, that these agencies maintain mindfulness of those impacts and that they seek to avoid actions that add significant amounts of carbon pollution to the atmosphere or actions that put people and property in the vulnerable position with respect to climate change.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to ensure that no funds are spent on activities that are not in compliance with the President's 2009 executive order on greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency and the 2013 executive order on climate change adaptation.

These orders require agencies to take global warming into account when making decisions and will save taxpayer dollars while making our communities safer and cleaner.

Our agencies need to be climate smart, because making our Federal investments and actions climate smart reduces our fiscal exposure to the impacts of climate change.

It is the right thing to do to run an efficient and effective government. It is the right thing to do to return the highest value to the American taxpayer.

It is simple: smarter investments up front mean we can reduce future costs. Communities across the Nation are thinking this way. We need to ensure that the same is true for the Federal Government.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment to ensure that Federal agencies are operating in the manner that accounts for climate change.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, earlier, we debated whether or not to continue a bipartisan reporting requirement in the bill on climate change expenditures. My colleague on the other side of the aisle wanted to remove the requirements, which would have reduced transparency. Now he wants to ensure that funds are being expended on climate and efficiency executive orders issued by the President. So I am left to wonder whether my colleagues would prefer to know if funds are spent on these programs or not.

Regardless, this amendment is simply unnecessary. The President did not consult Congress on these executive orders, so, if anything, we should defund the programs until Congress can have an appropriate policy debate.

I see no reason to include this language, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment which will ensure that no funds are spent on activities that are not in compliance with the President's executive order on greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency and the 2013 executive order on climate change adaptation.

These orders require agencies to simply take global warming into account when making decisions. This will save taxpayers lots of money while making our communities safer and cleaner.

Fighting climate change has to be regarded as the biggest imperative of our time.

□ 1815

My State of California has stepped up to this issue and taken important bold steps to confront it, including passing Assembly Bill 32, the world's most aggressive greenhouse gas reduction policy. At the Federal level, President Obama's efforts, through these orders, are critical steps toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change.

Ensuring compliance with these measures is the least we can do on this critical issue; and, frankly, we should be doing much more. So I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman from Virginia's (Mr. BEYER) amendment and continue this effort to combat climate change.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the committee for the excellent job that they have done under Chairman CALVERT's leadership with bringing this appropriations bill in under budget. It is $3 billion below the President's request. There is still $30.17 billion in proposed funding in this bill.

I come before you today to offer an amendment that I regularly offer to these appropriations bills, which is a 1 percent across-the-board spending cut. Let's go in and let's take one more penny out of every dollar and use that to bolster the good work that our committee has done.

You know, one of the things that I like about this bill is there is a 9 percent reduction in the EPA budget compared to last year. We all know we need to rein in the EPA. We are all for clean air, clean water, clean environment. We have different ways of getting there.

The burdensome regulations that are out there negatively impact—they negatively impact our communities. But we know there is more work that we have to do on this $30 billion budget.

My amendment would reduce the discretionary budget authority by $292 million and would reduce outlays by $193 million.

Now, I know that this is not a popular amendment with a lot of those who feel like we have cut, cut, cut and we can't cut any more.

I disagree with that. I think that you can look at the GAO reports and the inspector general reports and see there is plenty of room to cut. We just recently went into the last 4 years of inspector general reports. Guess what. We found $165 million of identified waste in the Department of the Interior.

It is time to engage our rank-and-file employees in our Federal Government, to make them a team and a partner with us as we work on this issue of getting our budget right-sized.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayer dollars, this is not an approach I can support.

While the President may have proposed a budget that exceeds this bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes tough choices within an allocation that adheres to current law.

While difficult trade-offs had to be made, the bill in its current form balances our needs. These trade-offs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts and are responsible.

We prioritize funding for fire suppression, PILT, and meeting our moral obligations in Indian Country, yet the gentlewoman's amendment proposes an across-the-board cut on every one of those programs.

This amendment makes no distinction between where we need to be spending to invest in energy independence and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals.

And, I may point out, the spending problem is not within these discretionary appropriation bills, which we are debating at the present time. It exists primarily in entitlement spending.

So I hope we can spend as much energy on the entitlement side of the budget as we are on the discretionary side of the budget. If so, we would fix our budget problems.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chair, this amendment I strongly oppose. It institutes a 1 percent across-the-board cut.

A few interesting things about the Interior bill. This bill before us today is $2 billion, $2 billion below 2010-enacted levels. And when you adjust this bill for inflation, it is at 2005 levels.

This amendment indiscriminately cuts programs without any thought to the merit of the program that is contained in this bill.

For instance, this would result in fewer patients being able to be seen at the Indian Health Service; fewer safety inspectors ensuring accidents do not occur; deferred maintenance on our Nation's drinking water and sanitation infrastructure, which is already underfunded in this bill.

More generally, investments in our environmental infrastructure and public lands will just be halted, and associated jobs would be lost with it.

As I said earlier, this bill is already underfunded, underfunded. When adjusted for inflation, it is at 2005 levels. This amendment would not encourage agencies to do more with less. It would simply force agencies and our constituents to do less with less.

So I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments.

Underfunded? No. We are overspent in this town. We have $18 trillion worth of debt, and it is time to get a handle on that.

Moral obligations? How about the moral obligation to our children and grandchildren?

Admiral Mullen has said the greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt.

Let's put the focus on our priorities: keeping our sovereignty and keeping our Nation safe and secure.

This is something we do for our children. It is something we can do for our national security. A penny on a dollar to get this spending under control.

Our approach? Guess what. State and local government use this all the time. They can't go print money and run up debt.

When I was in the State Senate in Tennessee, what did we do? We didn't go home until we balanced the budget because we had an obligation to get it done right the first time, before we walked out the door.

And I do hope that we will put attention on our entitlements. But that is no excuse for not addressing what is in front of us today. To not address what is in front of us today is to kick the can down the road.

I have a lot of constituents who aren't making and taking home as much as they were in 2005. They think we should reduce Federal spending even more, reduce the Federal workforce even more, because government is getting too expensive to afford.

Let's engage Federal employees in this process. It has worked for the States. It will work for the Federal Government. Let's get our fiscal house in order. A good place to start is right here with this amendment that would save another $193 million in outlays and $292 million in discretionary budget authority.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the last point. I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern about the deficit that we have.

When I came here 24 years ago, 40 percent of our expenditures were on the entitlement side of the budget. Today it is over 60 percent, over 60 percent. So we need to attack that side of the budget line.

If we placed as much energy on entitlement spending as we have on discretionary, not only would the budget be balanced, but we would be moving toward paying off our national debt.

With that, I reluctantly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. CALVERT. 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. HECK of Nevada) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, 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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MOTION TO PERMIT CLOSED CONFERENCE MEETINGS ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and Senate on H.R. 1735 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to authorize closure of conference meetings will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 91.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 12, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

YEAS—402

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs

Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—12

Amash
Blumenauer
DeFazio
Ellison
Harris
Herrera Beutler
Jones
Lummis
Massie
Sanford
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Clarke (NY)
Culberson
Davis, Danny
Deutch
Gutiérrez
Higgins
Hinojosa
Lofgren
Maloney, Carolyn
Miller (FL)
Peterson
Rooney (FL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)

□ 1855

Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Messrs. BLUMENAUER and SANFORD, and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. REED and COLE, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN'S I.D. CARD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 91) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to issue, upon request, veteran identification cards to certain veterans, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—411

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)	Yarmuth	Young (IA)
Wittman	Yoder	Young (IN)
Womack	Yoho	Zeldin
Woodall	Young (AK)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—22

Amodei	Davis, Danny	Peterson
Ashford	Deutch	Rooney (FL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gutiérrez	Rush
Brat	Higgins	Sanchez, Loretta
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Schakowsky
Bucshon	Lofgren	Westerman
Clarke (NY)	Maloney, Carolyn	
Culberson	Miller (FL)	

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 391, I was in the chamber and my vote did not register. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today on the motion to close portions of the conference report on H.R. 1735 and the Senate amendment to H.R. 91 because I was attending the funeral of a dear friend in Chicago. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for the following votes on July 7, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 390 and 391.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 390 and No. 391 on July 7, 2015.

If present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 390—Authorizing conferees to close meetings for H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, "aye," rollcall vote No. 391—on motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 91—Veterans I.D. Card Act of 2015, "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, RESILIENT FEDERAL FORESTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–192) on the resolution (H. Res. 347) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act and improve forest management activities in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROUZER). Pursuant to House Resolution 333 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. 2822.

Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1910

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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (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. 6, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 132, line 24.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a grazing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reaffirm Congress' support for the enforcement of grazing fees on public lands.

Grazing on public lands is a privilege, not a right, and it is critical that individual ranchers who use these lands abide by the law and pay their fair share.

My commonsense amendment simply confirms that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who does not comply with BLM regulations. My amendment does not penalize people for forgetting to repair a fence or for forgetting to make a payment once or twice.

Rather, this amendment ensures that egregious violations of grazing regulations are not going to be allowed to happen under the taxpayers' watch, as there are American taxpayers who work every day to ensure that all of their regulations are met.

Mr. Chairman, revenues from grazing fees go toward the management, maintenance, and improvement of public rangeland. The vast majority of ranchers understands how important these efforts are and pay their fees on time, but some ranchers are outright refusing to pay their grazing fees.

One particular rancher, who is well known to the media, has been more than $1 million in arrears since 1993. He has ignored the executive and judicial branches of our government, expanding his herds further onto our lands without permission.

Unauthorized grazing, such as in this case, has the potential to destroy habitat for protected species and to damage public property. In addition, he has instigated volatile situations that has put the lives of local and Federal Government officials at risk.

Unbelievably, some in this body have actually applauded these dangerous actions. That is simply irresponsible. Mr. Chairman, I strongly suspect that, if anyone in my congressional district in Phoenix forcibly resisted paying the Federal Government more than $1 million, he or she would be in handcuffs instead of on television or meeting with potential Presidential candidates.

□ 1915

Ultimately, however, this amendment is about more than one man. It is about upholding the basic principles that our laws should be applied fairly to everyone who lives in this country and uses its public lands.

Mr. Chairman, we must ensure that egregious violations of grazing regulations are not financed by the American taxpayer. To that end, I hope all Members will support this critical amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to increase the rate of any royalty required to be paid to the United States for oil and gas produced on Federal land, or to prepare or publish a proposed rule relating to such an increase.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New Mexico and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, Washington recently issued the advanced notice of rulemaking in which they declared they were going to consider raising the royalty rates on oil and gas production on Federal land. Now, there is several reasons that we would want to consider that before we implemented it, and so our amendment simply says let's stop the process.

First of all, what it does is it is going to drive the royalty rates up on Federal lands. It will be one more impediment to producing the oil and gas that fuels this Nation's economy.

Secondly, small businesses, small independent producers are already under pressure to try to just stay in business, and it would increase their operating costs. For a small State like ours, rural States, the small businesses, these local producers are sources of prosperity that are desperately missing from the rural parts of the country.

If we are going to have an economy that is healthy, if we are going to have an economy that provides jobs for the future, then we need energy that is both affordable and a predictable supply. Nothing is better than producing our own. When we have to import oil from other nations, some of those nations are unstable politically. Some just don't like us as a country; and so why not produce our own energy, providing our own jobs and providing revenues to the Federal Government?

Anytime you increase taxes on a given item, then you are going to see less of that item, and oil and gas is no exception. Let's let the department think about this just a bit more before we rush into a royalty rate which will decrease America's energy supply and make us more dependent on foreign oil.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, the amendment would prohibit the Bureau of Land Management from using its legal authorities to modernize its royalty rate structure, which would result in less revenue to the Treasury.

The Department of the Interior's oil and gas royalties have been the subject of repeated study by the Government Accountability Office and other entities for many years. In 2008, the GAO said the United States could be forgoing billions of dollars in revenue from the production of Federal oil and gas resources due to the lack of price flexibility in royalty rates and the inability to change the fiscal terms on existing leases. In 2013, the GAO issued another report that noted concern that the Department of the Interior had not taken the steps to change the onshore royalty rate regulations.

Modernizing the Bureau of Land Management's rate structures can provide critical flexibility, especially given the dramatic growth of oil development on public and tribal lands, where production has increased in each of the past 6 years and combined production was up 81 percent in 2004 versus 2008.

It seems to me that it is critical that the Department of the Interior is ensuring that the public is receiving a fair return from the production of oil and gas from Federal leases. This amendment would guarantee a sweetheart deal for Big Oil companies at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my cosponsors on this amendment: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. ZINKE. I appreciate their presence here.

The gentlewoman raises a significant question whether or not revenues would increase or decrease. We have got a couple of charts here showing exactly what is happening.

First of all, the average number of leases that the BLM issued during each administration, we can see back in the Reagan administration the highest level. It decreases down to—you can see the relative position of the Obama administration. If the administration were really interested in revenues, it seems like they would be producing the permits at a little faster rate.

Then this chart shows the oil production; the increase in oil production in blue is shown here on private lands while the decrease in oil production on the public lands is being shown in the red.

Again, if the administration were very interested, it seems like they would modernize not the royalty rate, but the way in which they approve these wells. Sometimes, wells go for 6 months or a year without being permitted, where States can offer 30-day processing of the permits.

The same is happening with natural gas. Again, we just see the blue on private lands where natural gas production is increasing, dramatic decreases in production of natural gas on Federal lands. Again, it looks like, if the agency were worried about the revenues, they would seek to modernize and update their procedures first.

I yield to the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for this amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I certainly understand his concern.

I would urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PEARCE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Bureau of Land Management has only just begun the process of examining whether royalty rates and rentals for oil and gas leases on public lands should be increased. That process should be allowed to continue.

GAO recently found that, based upon the results of a number of studies, the U.S. Government receives one of the lowest government takes, commonly understood to be the total revenue, as a percentage of the value of oil and natural gas produced in the entire world.

For example, royalty rates on public land are at 12.5 percent, considerably less than the royalty rates even on State lands, which range from a low of 16.67 percent to 25 percent-plus. These low royalty rates cheat the American taxpayers and keep them from receiving a fair return for the extraction of their oil and gas resources.

However, rental rates are even worse. To secure very valuable mineral rights, sometimes worth hundreds of millions of dollars, companies only have to bid a minimum, and I repeat, a minimum of $2 an acre upfront to win the lease and then $1.50 per acre each year to keep the lease. That is right, a rental of $1.50 per acre per year. This low price was last set by Congress in the 1980s and has not been adjusted since.

This can and should change. Oil companies, some of which generate billions of dollars per quarter in profits, should pay their fair share to the American people for the development of the Nation's public resources. Imagine if your rent had not increased since Ronald Reagan was President or if the local grocery store had not raised their prices since 1987.

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

Ms. PINGREE. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. This scenario may sound too good to be true, but in fact, that is exactly the sweetheart deal that we are currently giving oil and gas industries, a sweetheart deal that should end. All Americans must deal with the unavoidable reality of inflation; so why shouldn't oil and gas companies?

It is long past time for the BLM to assess better ways for the public to receive their fair share. Blocking the BLM from doing that is fiscally irresponsible, a giveaway to the oil and gas companies.

Ms. PINGREE. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico has 1 minute remaining, and the gentlewoman from Maine has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, the assumption that the royalty rates are abnormally low in the United States simply ignores the fact that we have lease

sales on top of the royalties. Many countries fail to have those.

The United States has the most extreme environmental regulations, so the regulatory burden gladly borne by the oil companies is an additional cost that many nations do not have. In addition, we have got income taxes paid by the companies, and many countries don't charge that on top of the royalty.

What we are hearing from our friends on the other side of the aisle about the sweetheart deals, I think, take a look and see actually how much the oil and gas companies are paying. In our State, they have contributed to two of the largest permanent funds in the world held by our State. I think oil and gas companies are paying their fair share by a lot.

What other industry is paying truck drivers $100,000 a year to drive a truck for a contractor? I think that those sorts of computations are simply ignored by the GAO.

Again, I would urge Members to support this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, in spite of the arguments that my colleague from New Mexico has made, I still say this amendment, in my opinion, doesn't pass the straight face test.

I can't imagine my constituents thinking that we should make things any easier for the oil and gas companies or that we should be giving away the opportunity to earn taxpayer revenue on our Federal lands.

The Federal onshore royalty rate has not been increased since 1920. That is 95 years. The offshore royalty rate is 18.75 percent; yet the onshore rates have been stuck at 12.5 percent for 95 years. Where is the equity in that?

As far as I am concerned, I think it is time for the American taxpayers to get a fair return on the use of public resources, especially from some of the most profitable companies in the world. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement National Park Service Director's Order 61 as it pertains to allowing a grave in any Federal cemetery to be decorated with a Confederate flag.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1930

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

I appreciate very much the bipartisan support and passage of my earlier amendment, which would end the practice of concessionaires in our national parks selling Confederate flags and memorabilia of the Confederacy.

We now, with this Interior Appropriations bill, have a second opportunity to speak on this very important national debate that we are having regarding symbols of the Confederacy. This additional amendment will end the practice of allowing groups to display Confederate flags on federally managed cemeteries.

The American Civil War was fought, in Abraham Lincoln's words, to ''save the last best hope of Earth.'' We can honor that history without celebrating the Confederate flag and all of the dreadful things that it symbolizes.

I request an ''aye'' of my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to lobby in contravention of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, on behalf of the proposed rule entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188; April 21, 2014).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, my amendment tells the Environmental Protection Agency to follow the law and clearly establishes the view of Congress that the EPA cannot lobby on behalf of the waters of the U.S. rule, in violation of the Anti-Lobbying Act.

Over the past few years, the EPA has been pushing the limits of its statutory authority to the issue of the waters of the U.S. rule. Now, we have learned that, as part of their efforts to regulate every pond, stream, and ditch in America, the EPA may have violated the Anti-Lobbying Act to garner public comments in support of the proposed rule, even though the Department of Justice has consistently stated that the act prohibits Federal agencies from engaging in substantial grassroots lobbying.

In fact, The New York Times recently reported:

In a campaign that tests the limits of Federal lobbying law, the Agency orchestrated a drive to counter political opposition from Republicans and enlist public support in concert with liberal environmental groups and a grassroots organization aligned with President Obama.

The New York Times went on to say as well:

The most contentious part of the EPA's campaign was deploying Thunderclap, a social media tool that spread the Agency's message to hundreds of thousands of people, a ''virtual flash mob,'' in the words of Travis Loop, the head of communications for EPA's water division.

Mr. Chairman, this is unseemly. The EPA Administrator later used the skewed results as evidence of public support before Congress.

For this reason, my amendment is needed to make clear that the EPA shall not violate the Anti-Lobbying Act while pursuing the completion of the waters of the U.S.

I respectfully urge all my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I agree with the gentleman and with The New York Times that this is why the underlying bill reduces funding for certain offices within EPA that were responsible for these questionable actions.

Therefore, this language is complementary to the approach the committee has already taken in the bill, and I urge an ''aye'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. WALBERG. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. The gentleman's amendment would prohibit funds in the act from being used to lobby on the waters of the U.S. There is an existing prohibition on lobbying that applies to all Federal employees that has been in place since 1919, so this is an unnecessary and redundant amendment.

I would remind my colleagues that Federal employees are not prohibited from providing information to Congress on legislation, policies, or programs. There must be an open dialogue between the legislative and executive branches to ensure that laws are being implemented appropriately and programs achieve their intended goals.

We should not and cannot operate in an information vacuum. We don't need

to add extraneous, redundant provisions to a bill that is already overburdened with harmful legislative riders.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

It is the law, and that is all I am trying to substantiate, but I have read to you not from an organ of the conservative Republican Party side, but from The New York Times.

They also went on to say:

> The architect of the EPA's new public outreach strategy is Thomas Reynolds, a former Obama campaign aid who was appointed in 2013 as an associate administrator.

He said this in relationship to flash mob tactics and the lobbying efforts:

> We are just borrowing new methods that have proven themselves as being effective.

Mr. Chairman, it may be effective, but it is unseemly that EPA, an agency of the Federal Government, would violate the law in lobbying and trying then to show Congress through trumped up evidence that they have produced through lobbying the private sector that they have support for the waters of the U.S. rule.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I think we need to establish it here very clearly in this appropriations bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
>
> LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 435 of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would not allow any funds to enforce section 435 of this bill, which is another harmful policy rider that limits the ability of our environmental agencies to take action to improve public health and fight the root causes of climate change.

This section blocks the EPA's ongoing efforts to regulate hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, which is the wrong approach. HFCs are factory-made gases used in air conditioning and refrigeration and are up to 10,000 times more potent than carbon dioxide. This potency has led to HFCs being referred to as a superpollutant. Unless we act now, United States emissions are expected to double by 2020 and triple by 2030.

While not as abundant as carbon dioxide, superpollutants, also known as short-lived climate pollutants—including HFCs, methane, and black carbon—have contributed up to 40 percent of observed global warming.

By limiting the EPA's authority under the Clean Water Act to propose, finalize, or enforce any regulation or guidance regarding HFCs, we undercut their ability to protect public health and demonstrate American leadership in emission reductions.

The EPA's Significant New Alternatives Policy Program, or SNAP, requires us to evaluate substitutes for superpollutants like HFCs that are harming public health and our environment. Through SNAP, we can ensure a more smooth transition to safer alternatives for our country's industrial sector.

Within the last week, EPA finalized a new rule on HFCs that the Environmental Investigation Agency estimates will avoid superpollutant emissions equal to the annual greenhouse gas emissions of more than 21 million cars by 2030. It will allow heavy users of HFCs, including supermarkets, which are the largest source of HFC emissions, to continue developing cleaner alternatives.

As we continue international negotiations to phase down HFCs, the United States should be a leader in reducing the use of HFCs and other superpollutants. The standard set by EPA will drive U.S. and international innovation and market development of low-emission and energy-efficient refrigeration, air conditioning, foam-blowing agents, and aerosol technologies.

These innovations will actually get at one of the root causes of climate change before we are forced to react to increasingly extreme weather and sea level rise.

American industry has already begun creating alternatives that both have a lower emissions profile and are more energy efficient than current HFCs, and last September, we saw major companies—including Coca-Cola, Carrier, DuPont, Honeywell, PepsiCo, and other industry leaders—commit to voluntarily reducing harmful HFC emissions.

My amendment simply bars funding to enforce section 435 of this bill so we can instead continue with existing rules and move our country's global leadership in finding innovative solutions to reducing emissions forward. We should not be handcuffing the important work being done at EPA to reduce superpollutants.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. The committee still has concerns about the costs, technology requirements, and compliance periods in the final rule. It is not clear why EPA divided some categories into subcategories and provided different deadlines for similar products.

The EPA clearly chose winners and losers. For the losers, the timetables remain unworkable. Manufacturers need time to implement engineering and technology changes and address new risk and safety challenges. Historic experience with the Montreal Protocol indicates that manufacturers need approximately 6-plus years to successfully transition between new materials.

This new rule will particularly be hard on small businesses. The large businesses that the gentleman mentioned have the resources and the technologies available to them to comply quicker. These smaller businesses will find it very difficult to comply with DOE's energy conservation standards.

EPA's proposal is not being driven by a statutory mandate, so the committee believes additional time is warranted. The EPA left critical decisions regarding energy, efficiency, and system performance up to the manufacturers; and they need time to get this right.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the constructive comments by my colleague, the gentleman from California. I would just suggest this is not the way to deal with these issues, but rather to address them via policy approach.

Section 435 of this bill will just take out the legs from all work we would do on HFCs and superpollutants, and it is just too broad a brush to paint with.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. I urge opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:
>
> RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to complete or implement the revision of the resource management plans for the Coos Bay, Eugene, Medford, Roseburg, or Salem Districts of the Bureau of Land Management or the Klamath

Falls Field Office of the Lakeview District of the Bureau of Land Management proposed in the Bureau of Land Management Notice of Availability of the Draft Resource Management Plan Revisions and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Western Oregon published in the Federal Register on April 24, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 23046).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Oregon and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, the past several decades have been really hard on Oregon's forested communities as timber harvest from Federal lands dropped more than 90 percent because of, in part, litigation, lack of management, government regulation.

Across the State, we have lost more than 300 forest product mills. They have closed. We have lost more than 30,000 forest-related jobs. This has left our communities in really bad shape, nearing bankruptcy in some cases in our counties, high poverty rates in our communities. Unemployment rates are high in these forested areas and, of course, we face, without active management, these enormous forest fires that contribute massively to the carbon buildup.

Recently, the BLM released a proposed update to their two-decade, 20-year-old management plan in western Oregon. The vast majority of the forests covered by these plans are what are called O&C lands, which are managed by a very unique Federal statute called the O&C Act. That law calls for sustainable timber production and revenue to local counties. It is different than the other forest laws.

Now, despite that clear mandate in Federal law, the BLM's proposal would allow for harvesting on about 22 percent is all, 22 percent of the land base. It would lock up the remainder in various reserves.

Oregon's forested counties, some of which have more than 70 percent of their land controlled by the Federal Government, rely on receipts from Federal timber projects to fund basic needs like law enforcement, schools, and other essential services. Unfortunately, under BLM's proposal, these counties would receive an estimated 27 percent is all of their historical average receipt—27 percent.

Now, while the BLM's proposed plans fall far short of meeting these communities' needs, it seems the agency is determined to push forward anyway with these plans.

In a bipartisan effort, the entire Oregon Congressional Delegation requested a 120-day extension of the comment period so that the counties and other interested parties have time to thoroughly review the more than 1,500 pages of analysis and provide some useful input and comment.

Apparently, the BLM isn't interested in that input, since I understand they will be rejecting our request and moving forward with their plan under their current timeline. That is really disappointing. You see, these local communities are most affected by the management changes on the Federal land that surrounds them, and the BLM, I wish, would care more about their input than a self-imposed deadline likely out of some office back here.

This amendment would simply delay the BLM's implementation of these proposed plans. That would give more time for our counties and interested parties to thoroughly review the more than 1,500 pages of analysis. It would also give the agency time to consider additional alternatives that better incorporate the clear mandates of the O&C Act.

I want to quote, Mr. Chairman, from the Portland Oregonian. This is the statewide newspaper that probably leans a little more to the left. They said: ''Minimally, BLM needs to extend its comment period and develop more alternatives to be considered. But it is unlikely to develop any alternative that would be acceptable to the industry, counties and environmental advocates. Congress, not a government agency, needs to step up and help solve this long-festering problem.''

Mr. Chairman, with Oregon's wildfire season well off to a terrible start, we need time to review these plans, get active management on these forestlands, and by passing this amendment, we will give the taxpayers, the people who live there, a better opportunity to weigh in. So I urge support.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment and yielding me time.

I appreciate the concerns that he brings to us today. It is troubling that the Bureau of Land Management has proposed land use plans that appear to contradict its multiple-use mandate. So with that, I would happily accept his amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the concerns raised by the gentleman from Oregon, but this amendment would prohibit the Bureau of Land Management from completing or implementing updates to certain resource management plans in western Oregon.

These updated plans cover 2.5 million acres of land that play an important role in the social, economic, and ecological well-being of western Oregon, as well as to the American public generally. The plans determine how BLM-administered lands will be managed to further the recovery of threatened and endangered species, provide for clean water, restore fire-adapted ecosystems, produce a sustained yield of timber products, and coordinate land management of surrounding tribal land.

The amendment would suspend the BLM's authority to implement a new resource management plan in western Oregon. As a result, the BLM would be forced to rely on a 20-year-old outdated plan that doesn't incorporate significant new information. For example, the old plan does not include important conservation activities, such as the northern spotted owl recovery plan. The amendment would block one of the most comprehensive and detailed landscape plans that the BLM has ever developed and would ignore significant public input. The public has a right to engage in the management decisions of their Federal lands.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the spotted owl is covered by their planning process today in some measure because it certainly contributed to the downfall of our communities, absent this plan.

Look, all we are asking for is time for people to have a better chance to review what this Federal agency, after 20 years, has finally come up with—1,500 pages. I think they should have a chance, as do my colleagues, including Mr. SCHRADER, a member of your party, supporting this amendment. So it is a bipartisan Oregon approach that I would hope my colleague from Maine would share that we need to do better managing America's Federal forests.

Turn on the TV. They are going up in flames right now. I don't like that for the habitat. I don't like that for the communities. I don't like that for what the firefighters have to face.

I think we can do better. Most observers in the State think we can do better, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, again, I just want to say I appreciate the concerns that the gentleman from Oregon has raised, and other Members from Oregon who share those concerns. I thought it was important to address some of the considerations and concerns that we have with this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to require companies to follow the law if they want to export crude oil from the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ISSUE ANY NEW FEDERAL OIL AND GAS LEASES AND DRILLING PERMITS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any new Federal oil and gas lease or drilling permit to any person that does not commit to following Department of Commerce regulations regarding the requirement of obtaining a license for exporting crude oil.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, I offer this amendment to require companies to follow the law if they want to export crude oil from the United States.

I want to make it clear. This amendment is not about whether we should lift the crude oil export ban altogether. That is a debate for a different time and a different bill. This is about those narrow cases where companies are currently able to export crude oil in limited quantities but are also choosing not to follow the rules.

Last summer, the Commerce Department ruled that two companies could export very light crude oil, called condensate, after it had been lightly processed. That decision meant that those companies would not need to obtain a license to export crude oil even though licenses are required for all other crude oil exports.

Because of that ruling, which I believe was inappropriate, another company decided that they, too, would begin exporting their own light crude oil without even asking the Commerce Department for a decision first, let alone try to get a license.

Since then, exports have skyrocketed. From January 2010 until June 2014, when the Commerce Department made that ruling, we exported about 97,000 barrels of crude oil a day, mostly to Canada. Since that day in June of 2014, our oil exports have quadrupled to an average of over 400,000 barrels a day, hitting all-time record levels, with more and more of that crude oil going to Europe and to Asia.

I don't think we should be exporting so much of our domestic oil when we are still importing roughly 7 million barrels every day. We may be the world's number one oil producer, but we are still the world's number one oil importer.

If we want to change that, we shouldn't be letting oil companies simply ship American crude oil anywhere in the world that they want to. We should certainly also not let them ignore existing laws and regulations in order to do so. First and foremost, oil produced in America, particularly oil from America's public lands that belong to the American people, should remain in this country for the benefit of the American people.

If we are going to allow these companies to export oil, they must follow the law. They simply can't take matters into their own hands and decide whether they need or do not need a license before shipping this oil all over the world.

My amendment is a simple, commonsense solution to this problem. It simply states, if you are going to drill on public land, you must follow the legal process for getting an export license if you want to ship that oil elsewhere.

This is not an onerous restriction. It only applies to public land, only requires companies to commit to following the existing process for getting a license with the Department of Commerce. That way, the Commerce Department can evaluate these options on a case-by-case basis to determine if they are in the national interest.

The concept of exporting American crude oil is too important to let the companies make that call on their own.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2000

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote on my amendment be withdrawn to the end that the amendment stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the noes have it, and the amendment is not adopted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARDY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make a Presidential declaration by public proclamation of a national monument under chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code in the counties of Mohave and Coconino in the State of Arizona, in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou in the State of California, in the counties of Chaffee, Moffat, and Park in the State of Colorado, in the counties of Lincoln, Clark, and Nye in the State of Nevada, in the county of Otero in the State of New Mexico, in the counties of Jackson, Josephine and, Malheur in the State of Oregon, or in the counties of Wayne, Garfield, and Kane in the State of Utah.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Nevada and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment with my good friends from Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon, and Utah to prohibit public land management agencies in this bill from making declarations under the Antiquities Act in counties where there is significant local opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by stating my strong support for our Nation's public lands. As an active hunter and an outdoorsman, I marvel at the beauty of our landscapes, our unique flora, and the abundant animal species that roam our terrain.

With that being said, I also come from Nevada, a State where roughly 85 percent of the land is controlled by the Federal Government.

Addressing this concentration of land use decisionmaking power in the hands of Washington bureaucrats has been one of the strong motivating factors during my time in this body, as I am sure that it has been for many of my colleagues in the Western States.

While this concentration is certainly a topic that should be addressed by the authorizing committees, I believe that we can and should take an important step here today.

A recent prominent example demonstrating the need for this amendment is the administration's draft proclamation to establish the Basin and Range National Monument on more than 700,000 acres of land in Lincoln and Nye Counties in my district.

Not only is the sheer size of the proposed monument staggering, being nearly as large as many of the Eastern States, it also poses some significant risks, both local and national in scope.

Nevada's economy was one of the hardest hit by the Great Recession, and far too many in our State are still struggling to get by. Nevada's rural county economies are particularly sensitive, and any decision that restricts ranching, recreation, and types of land use activities should have much of the local input as possible.

Earlier this year I spoke on the floor of the House about the national security implications of designating the Basin and Range, given that most of the acreage in the proposed monument falls directly under the airspace of the Nevada Test and Training Range, one of the most heavily used military operating areas, or MOAs, in the United States. Establishing this monument could drastically impair vital ground-based training activities tied to the NTTR.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, in my home State of Arizona, a few special interest groups have been pushing the President to unilaterally designate a massive new 1.7-million-acre national monument in the Grand Canyon watershed.

Twenty-six Members of Congress have joined me in opposing this misguided effort, and there is significant local opposition.

Here is a sample of those resolutions, and I would like to share a few of their comments here:

''The creation of a national monument by Presidential declaration does not allow for input from local communities . . . and could result in negative impacts for . . . grazing, hunting, water development and forest restoration . . . which would result in negative economic and public health impacts to the City of Williams.

''The Arizona Game and Fish Commission is concerned that the potential monument . . . 'will impede proactive and effective management of wildlife populations and habitats . . . and may result in reduced hunter opportunities and loss of revenues that directly support conservation and local communities.' ''

I could provide several more examples but will stop there.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I now ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nevada has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARDY. I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this Antiquities Act was passed over a century ago in 1906, when four States weren't even in the Union at that time. They were still territories.

There are absolutely no environmental laws that we had at that particular time protecting anything. Yet, this act was not used by every President. In fact, most Presidents never used it. Ronald Reagan never used it. Most Presidents only used it one time.

It was changed, starting with the Jimmy Carter administration, so that no longer is this act that was supposed to protect antiquities—thus, the name the Antiquities Act—used to protect antiquities. It was used as a political weapon and abused as a political weapon. The saddest part is there is absolutely no input that has to be guaranteed by this act.

In fact, the vast majority of monuments that were created through this Antiquities Act, there was no public input whatsoever. Any public input that took place was purely by accident, purely by coincidence.

The people in the counties that are designated in this amendment need to have the right to have some input in how land decisions are used that area. That is what this amendment does.

Give them the chance to be heard because, under the present Antiquities Act, they are not heard.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would place uncalled-for restrictions and undercut any President from using their authority under the Antiquities Act to establish a national monument, an authority, I should add, that has been available to Presidents for 100 years.

The Antiquities Act is an important tool that enables the President to protect and strengthen America's heritage. Since Theodore Roosevelt first designated the national monument Devil's Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America's best known and loved landscapes. Only three Presidents have not.

National monuments tell the story of the American people. Out of 460 national monuments and national parks, 113 reflect the diverse community that makes up our Nation. Nineteen recognize the achievements of the Latino community, twenty-six of the African American community, and eight for women.

It should be noted that an important factor in the designation process is the First Americans, the Native Americans, their legacy, their heritage, and their cultural and historic resources on the land.

But with the Antiquities Act, the lack of diversity reflected in our public units, whether it is parks or national monuments, is changing.

President Obama has been using the Antiquities Act to diversify the story of public lands with new designations such as the Cesar Chavez National Monument in Keene, California, which he recently designated.

Since the beginning of his administration, the President used this authority to create national monuments that recognize the contributions of Africa Americans and other diverse voices in this country.

The Center for American Progress published a report that found that 33 percent of presidential designations are inclusive of the American people, compared to only 20 percent of the designations done by Congress.

America's public places are becoming more inclusive, more representative of all Americans because of the Antiquities Act. This amendment would jeopardize that progress. I urge its defeat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARDY. How much time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Nevada has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me point out some obvious points.

This amendment, as I said earlier, would undermine conservation of public lands and stall efforts to ensure that our public places tell the very important diverse story of America and be representative of all Americans.

Development and conservation—to say that this would deny jobs and opportunities to particular regions is not true.

Over 9 million acres are available right now under energy leases from the Obama administration compared to—those were added to it—only 4.1 million acres that are now land that is protected.

Since its enactment in 1906, 16 Presidents have used it. 160 of America's best known landscapes have been preserved. National monuments designated under the Antiquities Act are comprised of existing Federal lands only. No new lands are added to the Federal estate by these designations.

National monument designations have better reflected the complexity—and Presidents have used that—of our Nation, ensuring that the voices of a changing and diverse community, which is this country, is told as we change and as we go forward.

I would urge a ''no'' vote. Undercutting an authority that existed for 100 years that has brought benefit to the Nation, enhanced the cultural, historic, and conservation ethics of this Nation should be preserved.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote amendment. It is unneeded, restrictive, and goes against a tradition and an authority that has existed in this country for 100 years.

I hope this effort is not about who is President at this time, but it is an authority that has been with us for 100 years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just like to reiterate to my colleagues that voting for this amendment is a vote for empowering the communities and the local stakeholders most affected by the monument designations.

Doing so will increase transparency, allow local input, and provide improved management of our public lands. It will fulfill the responsibility to ensure these communities have a legitimate voice in the process.

I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for

any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance that required that all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternative fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the President's memorandum by prohibiting funds in this act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles unless that purchase is made in accord with the President's memorandum.

I have submitted identical amendments to 18 different appropriations bills over the past few years, and every time they have been accepted by both the majority and the minority. I hope my amendment will receive similar support today.

Global oil prices are down. We no longer pay $147 per barrel. But despite increased production here in the United States, the global price of oil is still largely determined by OPEC.

Spikes in oil prices have profound repercussions for our economy. The primary reason is that our cars and trucks run only on petroleum.

□ 2015

We can change that with alternative technologies that exist today. The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America, over 633,000 vehicles. Almost 35,000 of these vehicles are within the jurisdiction of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel use. People there can drive to a gas station and choose whether to fill their vehicle with gasoline or with ethanol. They make their choice based on cost or whatever criteria they deem important.

I want the same choice for American consumers. That is why I am also proposing a bill this Congress, a bipartisan bill, as I have done many times in the past, which will provide for cars built in America to be able to run on a fuel instead of or in addition to gasoline. It is virtually very inexpensive, under $100 per car; and if they do it in Brazil, we can do it here.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, expanding the role these alternative technologies play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage that foreign government controlled oil companies hold over Americans. It will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose or develop legislation to redirect funds allocated under section 105(a)(2)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, my straightforward amendment would prohibit any effort to redirect funds allocated under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, also referred to as GOMESA.

GOMESA was passed in 2006 and created a revenue sharing agreement for offshore oil revenue between the Federal Government and four States in the Gulf of Mexico: Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and my home State of Alabama.

Under GOMESA, 37.5 percent of the revenues generated from selected oil and gas lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico is returned to these Gulf States. There is a reason the law was structured this way.

These Gulf States not only provide the lion's share of the infrastructure and workforce for the industry in the Gulf of Mexico; we also have inherent environmental and economic risks. The BP oil spill 5 years ago should tell us all what that means.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in his budget proposal this year, President Obama has recommended that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, under the Department of the Interior, redirect the distribution of expanded revenue payments expected to start in 2018 for the Gulf of Mexico oil and gas leases away from the Gulf Coast and instead be spent all around the country.

Not only does this proposal directly contradict the current Federal statute, it vastly undermines the purpose of the law, to keep revenues from these lease sales in the States that supply the workforce and have the inherent risk of a potential environmental and economic disaster.

My amendment today is simple, to protect the clearly defined statute and prevent the President from using these revenue sharing agreements as a slush fund for politically driven environmental projects across the country.

Regardless of whether you are from a Gulf Coast State or not, I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important amendment to protect the rule of law to support our coastal communities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to express a few concerns.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment is an overreaction to a policy proposal in the administration's—in the administration's—2016 budget request.

The President's budget requested to propose to direct funds currently allocated to payments to States and shift them more towards Federal programs that serve the Nation more broadly.

Now, this is a proposal that the President suggested in his budget, and it wasn't included in this bill because the Appropriations Committee just flat out rejected it. This is an appropriations process. That is what it is. It is a process.

The administration submitted a proposal. The committee evaluated it. It had the power to accept it or reject it. The proposal lay with the committee as to what to do. As I said, the committee rejected it.

This amendment would unnecessarily stifle any proposals to amend current formula, which is unnecessary because Congress would need to enact legislation before any changes could be made to the formula.

The Department of the Interior doesn't have the authority to change the formula through rulemaking or other administrative action. Basically, this amendment would prohibit the Department from even suggesting an idea for Congress to consider.

I just wanted to claim the time in opposition, Mr. Chair, just to say I really think this amendment—although it appears that the majority is going to take it and I am not going to ask for a vote or anything on it—is just really, in my opinion, political overreach.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I wish that these sorts of amendments were unnecessary, but the way this administration plays fast and loose with its interpretation of the law, particularly through these administrative agencies, I am afraid it is necessary to protect a law passed by this Congress in 2006 in recognition of the inherent risk that these four Gulf States have produced so much energy for this country have, and

without it, we will have an agency that will take the laws that exist—even this appropriations bill—and interpret it the way they want to, and this amendment makes it very clear they can't do that, that these four coastal States will retain control over these moneys as it was enacted by this Congress in 2006.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentlewoman's point of view. I wish it were unnecessary, but given the behavior of this administration through these administrative agencies, I am afraid it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the Members to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds $3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule during the 113th and 114th Congresses.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractor.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. ZINKE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS WITH RESPECT TO VALUATION OF COAL

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce subparts F and J of part 1206 of the proposed rule by the Department of the Interior entitled ''Consolidated Federal Oil & Gas and Federal & Indian Coal Valuation Reform'' and dated January 6, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 608).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Montana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of economic opportunity for local communities across the Nation.

In my home State of Montana, the Crow Nation suffers from unemployment rates as high as 50 percent, despite having over $1 billion in coal reserves. Similar situations play out in communities across America. This administration has waged a war against coal. In the words of Crow Chairman Old Coyote: ''A war on coal is a war on the Crow people.''

Republicans and Democrats agree; we all want clean air and water and affordable power. Thankfully, advances in technology have made it possible to have both, making it possible to use our vast resources of clean coal to power American homes and manufacturers and put Americans back to work. We can't power the American economy on pixie dust and hope; it takes innovation and investment in areas like clean coal.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, this administration is fighting a more aggressive war against American coal than they are against ISIS. We all know of countless attempts to kill coal with regulations, cap-and-trade, and carbon taxes.

Now, the most recent attempt is by the Department of the Interior. The DOI is planning to change how coal on Federal lands and reservations is valued, creating an unpredictable and unstable market that threatens the livelihoods of our local communities and tribes.

When oil, gas, and coal resources are sold, local communities receive tax revenues and royalties to help fund everything from education to infrastructure. However, this administration's one-size-fits-all plan puts funding in jeopardy; places heavier burdens on States and local governments; and also stifles innovation, investment, and job creation.

The national labor participation is the lowest it has been in the past 30 years. Wages are stagnant; the cost of living is going up, and energy prices for home heating and manufacturing are skyrocketing. Our communities simply can't afford another Federal assault on our economy.

These jobs are real, Mr. Chairman. I have been to the Rosebud Mine in Colstrip where union jobs earn their paychecks to provide for their families. This is not just a couple hundred jobs in Montana. There are thousands more like them in Kentucky, West Virginia, Utah, and beyond.

Whether the coal is mined in Montana or turned into electricity to build cars in Michigan, coal is a critical part of our American economy. Again, I am reminded of the words of Chairman Old Coyote: ''For the Crow people, there are no jobs that compare to a coal job—the wages and benefits exceed anything else that is available.''

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting for American workers and American jobs by supporting my amendment to block funding for the Obama administration to continue their war on coal.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

It is a good amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would deny the American public, especially Native Americans, a fair return for the use of their coal resources.

The current coal valuation regulations have been in effect since 1989. A lot has happened in the intervening 26 years since these regulations were last updated. It has now been nearly 3 years since it was first reported that coal companies were skirting Federal royalty payments by selling coal to sister companies in order to value exported coal at low domestic prices rather than the much higher prices these sister companies were selling the exported coal for in overseas markets.

Now, while there has been a boom for Western coal companies, it has meant the Federal Government and Western States—where we share 50–50 of the royalties—have forgone hundreds of millions of dollars that are rightly due the American people.

These coal royalty valuations especially hurt Native Americans who depend on these royalties for their income. The proposed regulations were a response to States such as Wyoming pleading with the Department of the Interior: Do not allow coal producers to create affiliates to reduce the royalties paid.

This amendment offers Members a stark contrast. Do they want to side with the coal industry which has been gaming the existing royalty system? Or do they stand with the American public, especially Native Americans, in seeing that coal is fairly priced and that the royalties due Western States, tribes, and the Federal Government are paid?

I, for one, will stand with the American people and especially my Native American brothers and sisters to make sure that they are treated fairly.

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

□ 2030

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, current Federal coal valuation rules have provided stable and significant royalty revenue to State, tribal, and Federal governments. Despite this tract record, the Department of the Interior has carelessly proposed to modify the valuation of Federal and Indian coal by granting the Office of Natural Resources Revenue new authority to deem sales, potentially disallow costs, and use the default rule to assert arbitrary values for royalty purposes.

These broad new authorities come without clear or transparent guidelines for regulators and regulated parties alike, setting the stage for inconsistent valuation and protracted litigation. Furthermore, the arbitrary regulatory environment created by this rule could jeopardize affordable and reliable energy production, American jobs, and crucial revenue for State, Federal, and tribal governments.

For these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and to stop funding for this new rule until the Department of the Interior can demonstrate the need, if there is any—and I am skeptical—to radically alter the way royalties are accessed on Federal coal.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, as the sole Representative of the great State of Montana, I do represent, and am proud to represent, the Crows, the Northern Cheyenne, the Assiniboine Sioux, and our American Indian tribes and great nations and understand the value of having a prosperous economy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like the support of all Members.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat, it has now been nearly 3 years since it was first reported. Coal companies were skirting Federal royalty payments by selling coal to sister companies in order to value exported coal at low domestic prices rather than the much higher prices these sister companies were selling the exported coal for in overseas markets.

It is our job—it is our job—to see that coal is fairly priced and that the royalties due to Western States, tribes, and the Federal Government are paid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. 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 Montana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

REVISION OF DOLLAR AMOUNTS

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Departmental Operations'' for payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, and increasing the aggregate amount made available for ''Environmental Protection Agency—Hazardous Substance Superfund'', by $22,884,840.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

This is a very simple amendment that would increase funding for the Superfund with the intention the money go specifically to the cleanup program account. Superfund cleanup is right for the environment and certainly right for the U.S. economy, which is right for the U.S.

I come from New Jersey, the Garden State. We have great tomatoes, corn, and it is blueberry season. But what we also have, particularly in the southern half of the State, is a history of heavy industry.

New Jersey found out the hard way that you just can't take those resources after they are finished and dump them into the backyard. We have more than 200 sites in New Jersey listed as being in serious violation of at least one of four Federal environmental laws. The company offenders, they are gone, and left the constituents, my constituents, holding the bags.

My predecessor, Representative Jim Florio, back in the early eighties, was the author of the Superfund bill. He had the vision of what we have to do to protect our citizens.

I just want to tell a quick story, two of them.

The first one is one site, $1 billion, and it is about a quarter of a mile from where I live. It is the Welsbach & General Gas Mantle in Gloucester City, New Jersey. As part of that process of making gas mantles almost a half century ago, radium, the substance that was used to make it glow brighter, was dumped throughout the city. This material is now sitting there. Radium has a half-life of 1,600 years—1,600 years. The process started in 1996, and it is about two-thirds finished. There is no company to go back to.

The second story is Sherwin Williams in Gibbsboro, which was a gorgeous spot. But as we all know, years ago, that lead paint is now in the water system and impacting that area horribly. The site includes Kirkwood Lake. The soil under the lake is contaminated. They can't use the lake.

These are two very simple stories. I have 15 Superfund sites in my district—15.

It is our responsibility to protect our citizens. There are no companies to go back to. That is why I offer this simple amendment. The damage is already done, and we must continue to protect our citizens by funding this amendment correctly.

I want to thank the chairman, with the understanding that this amendment will be ruled out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment with the hope that we continue to work on this important issue in a very bipartisan way to protect our citizens.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOLLY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to research, investigate, or study offshore drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

As a nation, we continually strive to achieve both energy independence, as well as protect the environment, our critical habitats, and the quality of life

in communities like Pinellas County, Florida, that I have the opportunity to represent.

One way we strike that balance is represented in how we currently manage the Gulf of Mexico when it comes to oil drilling. Under a 2006 act, we allow for drilling exploration in the central and western Gulf off the coast of Texas and Louisiana and other States, but we have a ban that protects the State of Florida. That ban currently protects the State of Florida with a drilling ban of about 125 miles or, in some cases, 235 miles.

This ban has been in place for 32 years through the operations of the Appropriations Committee. And while the current statute allows for the ban through 2022, year after year, those on the other side of this debate, very respectfully, attempt to erode that ban.

The truth is we don't need any additional drilling in the eastern Gulf of Florida to achieve energy independence. There are nearly 1,000 active leaseholds in the central and western Gulf. There are probably nearly 3,000 more available. And to change the ban is just something that we don't need.

This amendment is very simple. It says none of the funds may be used to study, prepare for, research, investigate any increased offshore oil drilling in the eastern Gulf contemplating the expiration of a ban in 2022.

I am pleased to be joined in offering this amendment by my colleague from Bonita Springs, Mr. CLAWSON; my colleague from Tallahassee, Ms. GRAHAM; and my colleague from Jupiter, Mr. MURPHY.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as in the case of a number of offshore-related amendments that we will deal with today, the Interior Appropriations bill is not the appropriate venue, though I do understand it has been used in the past.

I understand this amendment dovetails with the current congressional moratorium, and the Department of the Interior has no intention of acting in a manner that is contrary to congressional intent. The Department is focused on the next 5-year oil and gas leasing plan, which is limited to 2017–2022, so many departmental activities in fiscal year 2016 are already limited in scope through 2022. If my colleagues wish to see the moratorium extended beyond 2022, then they should work with the appropriate authorizing committees.

With that, I would oppose the amendment, and urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's understanding of the interest of those in the State of Florida and the current debate currently from those on the other side that wish to actually lift the ban. It is important that, as a delegation, we have the opportunity to have this debate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON), my colleague from Bonita Springs.

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I start by thanking Representative JOLLY for his leadership and persistence on this issue—it is so important to my district—and to the chairman for allowing disagreement. Disagreement allows learning, and we appreciate your leadership in this regard.

I speak in full support of Representative JOLLY's amendment. I base my support on the enormous all-time high, proven reserves elsewhere in our country and a conviction that we can focus in areas other than the Gulf.

The private sector definitely needs cheap oil, and our businesses, our manufacturing companies, cannot be successful without low energy prices. I know it, because I lived it.

But let's drill where drilling makes sense. And to us, it doesn't make sense to drill in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. The recent BP settlement, the highest such settlement ever, is evidence that the economic and environmental risk of drilling in the Gulf greatly offset any potential returns.

For those of us who live, work, or have business in the Gulf, we were told that an oil disaster could never happen, and then it happened. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

I say it is not worth the risk. I say let's do everything we can to never have more drilling in the eastern Gulf.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that, again, I am in reluctant opposition to this amendment. This should be dealt with in the authorizing committees.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would close by offering my colleagues there is authorizing legislation that would extend the ban past the year 2022.

This language simply says a ban is a ban is a ban. And while there is a ban on activities on drilling and the like, this simply says that no planning may occur for post-2022 drilling.

With that, I would urge a ''yea'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 2045

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I think I will start this discussion with the words of a rather influential individual: Pope Francis. In his recent encyclical, he wrote: ''If present trends continue, this century may well witness extraordinary climate change and an unprecedented destruction of ecosystems, with serious consequences for all of us.'' That is Pope Francis.

In this legislation, the appropriation bill, there are numerous efforts to deny the reality of climate change. And, specifically, what I want to deal with on this amendment is Executive Order No. 13693: Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade.

The intention of this amendment is to support the Federal Government's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 40 percent over the next decade relative to 2008.

This bill will save taxpayers money—about $18 billion—in avoided energy costs, and it will increase the share of electricity the Federal Government consumes from renewable resources by up to 30 percent. Twenty-six million metric tons of greenhouse gases would be eliminated.

So why in the face of all of the scientific evidence and why in the face of the reality that the climate is, indeed, changing, when we have throughout the State of California and around the Nation local governments planning for the eventually, not the reality, of higher sea levels, would we put forth a bill that would prohibit the Federal Government from planning for climate change?

Let me just cite some of the ways in which the current legislation, this proposal, deals with it:

It prohibits Federal funds for any rulemaking or guidance with regard to the social cost of climate change.

It prohibits the EPA from limiting carbon pollution from new and renovated power plants, and there has been much discussion about that on the floor today.

It prohibits the funding to update and revise the EPA's ozone standards.

It prohibits the funding for any change to the status of HFCs. These are fluorocarbons.

It also prohibits the reporting detailing the Federal funding for domestic and international climate change programs. This is denial, denial, denial about what is really happening.

My amendment would simply say that there is no money to carry out these provisions in the current bill. It is really time for all of us here to recognize that there is a serious challenge, and it is one that Pope Francis points out so clearly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, climate change is winning the amendment contest tonight. We have had a number of amendments on that subject.

Earlier we debated whether or not to continue a bipartisan reporting requirement in the bill on climate change expenditures.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle wanted to remove that requirement, which would have reduced transparency. Now my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on climate and efficiency executive orders issued by the President.

So I am left to wonder whether my colleagues would prefer to know if the funds are spent on these programs or not.

Regardless, this amendment is certainly unnecessary. The President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. If anything, we should defund these programs until Congress can have an appropriate policy debate. I see no reason to include this language, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, the executive order by the President is very straightforward. It basically says that the Federal Government shall reduce greenhouse gases, and he is using his appropriate authority as the administrative agent of our government to find ways to do that.

Certain goals are set in the executive order, for example, reducing greenhouse gases by 40 percent over the next decade. What could be wrong with that when you save $18 billion in the process and create more opportunities for renewable energy by up to 30 percent?

Why would we pass a bill in this appropriation bill that would go in exactly the opposite direction, one that would actually create greater greenhouse gases and lead more directly and more imminently to the climate crisis?

I fail to understand why we would want to take up a piece of legislation that has so many provisions in it that deny the reality of climate change, that puts this government on the course to spend more money on programs that actually create a crisis that will be extraordinarily expensive.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on this amendment, which would maintain the President's executive order and keep America on a path that all the world should carry out.

Pay attention to what Pope Francis said: ''If present trends continue, this century may well witness extraordinary climate change and an unprecedented destruction of ecosystems, with serious consequences for all of us.''

This is not something we should deny. This is something we should, in fact, pay attention to, and we ought to be able to maintain the President's executive order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the President did make his unilateral determination in an executive order. We have an opportunity to vote ''no'' on this amendment, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the requirements of part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to any farm (as that term is defined in section 112.2 of such title).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Arkansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in defense of agricultural producers across our Nation who are facing the heavy hand of EPA regulations.

The EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule for on-farm fuel storage requires farmers and ranchers to make costly infrastructure improvements to their oil storage facilities to reduce the possibility of an oil spill.

These regulations fail to take into account the relative risk of oil spills on farms, and they do not factor in the simple fact that family farmers are already careful stewards of our land and water. No one has more at stake in the health of their land than those who work on the ground from which they derive their livelihoods.

The USDA itself discovered little evidence of oil spills on farms and determined in a recent study that more than 99 percent of farmers have never experienced a spill.

To require that all of our producers make a significant investment to prevent such an unlikely event seems out of touch with reality and disregards the already overwhelming number of safeguards our farmers already employ.

My amendment would restrict the EPA's ability to enforce SPCC regulations on farms so that farmers and ranchers can go about their business of producing food and fiber without having to worry about unnecessary compliance costs and red tape.

On three separate occasions, the House unanimously passed my bipartisan legislation, the FUELS Act, which rolled back these same SPCC regulations on farms. I urge my colleagues to again support our farmers and ranchers by supporting this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop the EPA from requiring farms to submit a plan on how they will prevent oil from entering navigable waters.

I come from Minnesota; so, this seems like a pretty commonsense requirement to me. If a facility has large amounts of oil, it should tell the agency responsible for an inland oil spill cleanup how it will prevent an environmental disaster.

Why shouldn't the holder of gallons of oil have a plan even if it is an agriculture business? It should have a plan. And there are criteria to make sure that a facility truly should be subject to the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule.

It has to meet three criteria. It must be nontransported. It must have an aggregate aboveground storage capacity greater than 1,320 gallons or a completely buried storage capacity greater than 42,000 gallons. We are talking about a lot of oil.

The third point is that there must be a reasonable expectation that, if something were to go wrong and if there were a discharge, it would go into navigable waters of the United States or of adjoining shorelines.

In other words, if there is an accident and if there is water nearby, you would need to have a plan in place so that not only would oil not seep in and ruin your land, but that it would not flow into waters past the boundaries of your water and just keep polluting.

The preparation of the SPCC plan is the responsibility of a facility owner or operator or it can be prepared by an engineer or a consultant, but it must be certified by a registered professional engineer.

Let's just think about it. You have 42,000 gallons of oil stored underground, and you have 1,320 gallons of oil above. All this does is say you need to have an emergency plan if, when that accident would occur—and it can

occur—there would be the possibility of having that oil go into navigable waters and spread onto other property owners' land or State land or Federal land.

I think these sound like reasonable requirements. It is a small step to help work with the farmer to prevent an environmental disaster that would most likely end up being cleaned up with taxpayers' funds.

I always think you should hope for the best, but you always need to have a plan just in case something goes wrong. This rule requirement makes sure that these facilities that meet these criteria have a plan in place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act may be used for the purchase or display of a confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances where the flags provide historical context as described in the National Park Service memorandum entitled ''Immediate Action Required, No Reply Needed: Confederate Flags'' and dated June 24, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the use of funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act for the purchase or display of a Confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances when such flags provide historical context as set forth by the National Park Service in their memo to all park superintendents, dated June 24, 2015.

□ 2100

The National Park Service has jurisdiction over operation of the National Park System, associated sites such as national heritage areas, and various State grant accounts.

In light of recent events, the display of the Confederate flag has been at the forefront of discussion throughout our Nation. This amendment is consistent with a bipartisan effort across the country to promote harmony and not division in this great Nation.

On June 17, we were all shocked by the heinous massacre that took the lives of nine God-fearing African American churchgoers in Charleston, South Carolina. This act of domestic terror was carried out by an individual who idolized the Confederate flag and harbored racist beliefs, calling for a return to the human subjugation of others on the basis of race.

Unfortunately, that same Confederate flag flew on the grounds of the State capitol amidst the funeral of a State senator and dedicated pastor who taught that we are all God's children at the historic Emanuel AME Church.

We have come a long way in America, but we still have a long way to go in our march toward a more perfect Union. The cancer of racial hatred continues to adversely impact our society, and people of good will must unite to eradicate it. Limiting the use of Federal funds connected to the purchase or display of the Confederate flag is an important step in that direction.

Earlier today, lawmakers in South Carolina from both sides of the aisle came together to support removing the Confederate battle flag from their State capitol grounds. This evening, the United States House of Representatives has the opportunity to further limit the public display of this divisive symbol that is so closely associated with defense of the institution of slavery.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their consideration. For the aforementioned reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy that this opportunity has been presented for us to have a discussion on the House floor and the National Park Service doing the right thing about the removal of this symbol of what has become racist hate speech.

I thank the gentleman for bringing forward the amendment, and I rise in support of it.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her support.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to propose, finalize, implement, or revise any regulation in which the research data relied on to support such action is subject to OMB Circular A-110 and is withheld in contravention of the Freedom of Information Act as prescribed under OMB Circular A-110 or if the Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency fails to provide scientific advice as may be requested on such regulation to the Congress in contravention of section 4365 of title 42, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects the core principles of two bills passed by the House earlier this year with bipartisan support. They are H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, and H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act.

I am pleased to be joined by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's former Subcommittee on Environment chairman, Representative DAVID SCHWEIKERT, who sponsored the original version of the Secret Science bill in 2014.

The amendment simply requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on publicly available data that can be verified. Why would the administration want to hide this information from the American people? We must make sure that Federal regulations are based on science that is available for independent review.

Many Americans are unaware that some of the EPA's most expensive and burdensome regulations, such as its proposed climate and ozone rules, are based on underlying data that not even the EPA has seen.

This amendment ensures that the decisions that affect every American are based on independently verified, unbiased, scientific research instead of on secret data that is hidden from the American people. That is called the scientific method.

This amendment also ensures that the EPA Science Advisory Board is able to provide meaningful, balanced, and independent assessments of the science behind the EPA regulations. The EPA frequently undermines the SAB's independence and prevents it from being able to provide advice to Congress. As a result, the valuable advice these experts can provide is often ignored or silenced.

The public's right to know must be protected in a democracy. This amendment ensures that happens. The EPA has a responsibility to be open and transparent with the people it serves and whose money it uses.

Anyone who supports government transparency and accountability should be able to support this amendment. It helps EPA and the Obama administration keep their promise to be open and honest with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the Appropriations subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman. I certainly rise in support of this amendment. Having chaired that subcommittee for 6 years and knowing the good work of that subcommittee, I think the intent of the

language aligns with the two authorizing bills passed by the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology earlier this year. I certainly voted for them both times.

I think it is a good amendment, so I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his comments. I very much appreciate his support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment seeks to stop the Environmental Protection Agency from issuing regulations through two different mechanisms.

The first one would prevent the EPA from issuing regulations if supporting research data is withheld under the Freedom of Information Act.

Second, it would withhold regulations if the Agency's Science Advisory Board does not provide the requested advice and information to Congress.

I would just like to take a moment to address each one of these issues fully. Last year, for example, the EPA received 10,500 FOIA requests—Freedom of Information requests—or an average of 40 per workday.

These requests required nearly $11 million—$11 million—in personnel costs to process; yet the EPA receives less than $1 million to collect fees for these requests. They get $11 million in personnel costs to process; yet they get less than $1 million to collect the fees for these requests. You can simply do the math.

There are only nine allowable exemptions under the law that would prevent the EPA from complying with FOIA requests in the first place. These exemptions range from classified national defense, foreign relations information, to confidential business information and matters of personal privacy, things which we discuss in this room all the time.

The amendment is simply another attempt to stop the EPA from issuing regulations, many of which are required by law and are designed to improve human health and the environment.

Now, that was in regards to the first point about EPA issuing regulations on the Freedom of Information Act, lack of funding available to do it, and then they are following the laws with the nine exemptions.

Now, with regard to the Science Advisory Board, let me remind my colleagues that these boards are comprised of nearly four dozen experts from academia. For example, there are academics from the University of Texas Health Science Center in Houston, Texas; the Environmental Systems and Research Institute in Redlands, California; and from the University of Minnesota, my home State.

Now, in my opinion, it is very disingenuous to suggest that this Advisory Board's subject matter of experts would withhold information to Congress. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, which simply puts two more roadblocks in the EPA regulations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds simply to point out that this amendment does not prevent the EPA from issuing any regulations.

In fact, it doesn't take a position on regulations. It simply says that the underlying data that the EPA is using to justify regulations needs to be made public. I don't know who could oppose transparency and honesty by this administration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), who as I mentioned a while ago is a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and is now a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire into the remaining time on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, in this 45 seconds, I want to walk through a couple mechanical things really quickly. First off, this amendment is based on the OMB's circular that actually said this data is supposed to be public.

Number two, the release of data, if you are making rules, does not pre-assume that the reg is too tough, too little, too soft. What it means is, if you are going to be doing public policy—public policy—doesn't the public deserve access to public data because there is lots of smart people out there on the left and the right or just academia that should have this information, this raw data, to decide are we doing it the most rational, the most powerful way?

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to once again reiterate there are only nine allowable exemptions under this law that would prevent the EPA from complying with FOIA requests.

These exemptions range from classified national defense, foreign relations information, confidential business information, and matters of personal privacy.

Once again, Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, which simply works to put roadblocks in front of the EPA ever being able to issue a regulation.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule following the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Dog Management Plan (Plan/SEIS), Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), California (78 Fed. Reg. 55094; September 9, 2013).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

□ 2115

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, ''Ruff.'' That is what my dog Buddy says when he wants to go out for a walk, and that is what dogs throughout the bay area have been accustomed to doing in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area for decades.

I, like them, believe that the GGNRA should be able to afford the opportunity for people to recreate, whether one wants to watch a bird, ride a horse, walk a path, or climb a hill. Some of these uses are incompatible, but that doesn't mean we should ban them. That means that we should create opportunity for all.

In San Mateo County, in my district, the GGNRA is proposing zero off-leash dog areas, closing down one site that has been in operation for over many decades.

For 40 years, people and their dogs have been welcome at the beaches and trails of the GGNRA, which compromises 80,000 acres across San Francisco, Marin, and San Mateo Counties. This public land provides much-needed recreational space in the densely populated bay area.

Today, that access is at risk. The National Park Service is trying to dramatically change how it manages recreational areas in the bay area by turning the majority of open space in the GGNRA into what are called controlled zones, where visitor access and activities could be highly restricted. Public use could be denied for longstanding activities in the GGNRA, like hiking, surfing, bike riding, horseback riding, and dog walking.

The bay area is densely populated, and open space is precious. For many, the GGNRA is the only option for time outdoors.

My amendment would slow the National Park Service's regulatory overreach and ensure that people in the bay

area continue to have recreational access to these urban parks.

People and nature aren't incompatible. We can be good stewards and also allow those in the GGNRA to have access to this very beautiful area.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote, Mr. Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to whether a rule ''follows'' a specified Environmental Impact Statement.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS LEASING

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any oil and gas lease under the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program unless the Secretary of the Interior has entered into revenue sharing agreement with each affected State.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my amendment withholds funding for permitting of offshore oil exploration until the Secretary of the Interior reaches revenue-sharing agreements with coastal States.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program opens the mid- and south Atlantic regions to oil and gas development after several decades of being off-limits.

While advanced drilling techniques and spill response have made environmentally safe access to oil and gas reserves in the Atlantic possible, coastal States should consider and prepare for impacts that offshore energy development present.

Sharing of revenues with coastal States will help address the risk and responsibilities that States and coastal counties assume with offshore energy development. These revenues would help State governments expand coastal management and conservation, build necessary infrastructure, fund emergency preparation and response, and expand public service to support the influx of new industry and workforce.

Involving the coastal infrastructure and management will add to the overall economic well-being of the coastal communities. Before our coastal States agree to share in the burden of offshore drilling, we ought to ensure that our coastal States are able to share in the economic blessings of such drilling.

My amendment would prohibit funding for implementation of BOEM's plan until the Secretary of the Interior enters into a revenue sharing agreement with the States affected.

While it may not be possible this evening to adopt my amendment for coastal States, as we move forward with energy exploration off our coastlines, please be mindful of revenue sharing.

Because I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order, I plan to withdraw this amendment. But before I withdraw my amendment, I ask for the chairman's consideration to assist in development of revenue sharing agreements to compensate the coastal States and help them to mitigate risk.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I would be happy to work with the gentleman in the future to see if there is a methodology where we can move your idea forward and see if we can't get the Federal Government and States to cooperate to their mutual, I think, benefit on this issue.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the chairman's consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF FIRE PREPAREDNESS FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transfer funds made available by this Act for fire preparedness activities to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for fire suppression activities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to figure out where to start with this, because we are making progress. I guess the purpose of this amendment is to give this whole process a swift kick so we can actually do something that is absolutely necessary.

The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee really has it correct. And I want to read the language of the appropriations bill, which I happen to agree with this evening, but not the result.

In 7 of the last 10 years, the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior have exceeded their wildland fire suppression budgets despite being fully funded at the 10-year suppression average for such costs.

Fire seasons have grown longer and more destructive, putting people, communities, and ecosystems at greater risk. Fire borrowing has now become routine rather than extraordinary. Borrowing from nonfire accounts to pay suppression costs results in the Forest Service and Department of the Interior having fewer resources for forest management activities, including hazardous fuels management and other proven efforts, to improve overall forest health and reduce the risk of catastrophic wildland fires.

Mr. Chairman of the subcommittee, you have it right. You and your committee staff have done the right analysis but haven't completed the follow-through to achieve that goal.

I see our good friend from Idaho standing nearby, and he has a very, very fine bill to deal with this. It would basically create two separate accounts. Now, understanding the necessity of proper order and being out of order, which sometimes I am, I am not proposing that we adopt the good gentleman from Idaho's bill in this bill, but I have got a different idea. I am going to take this idea from my Republican colleagues who have created so many fiscal crises, otherwise known as cliffs, to create one.

Basically, what I am doing here with this amendment is saying you can't borrow from other accounts, and when you run out of money, my goodness, we have a crisis. We will have to then adopt my good friend from Idaho's legislation and solve the problem once and for all.

So that is what this amendment does. It says you can't borrow from other accounts to fight wildfires, which means that we are going to have to come to grips with the reality of our funding crisis—where we cannot get ahead of the wildland fires, where there is a necessity for us to spend money on

protecting the forests and forest health, thinning and other kinds of things, firebreaks and the like, so we don't just burn down all the forests to get around with the proper management. This is what you call kicking the issue into gear.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, and we are on the same page, actually, in ultimately what we want to accomplish with this.

The fact is that we appropriate money—the Interior Subcommittee has done it for several years now, and Chairman CALVERT has done it in this bill—where, under the FLAME Act, we fund the 10-year average of what it costs to fight wildfires. Unfortunately, I think it is in 8 of the last 10 years we have exceeded that 10-year average. Consequently, when money runs out for fighting wildfires, what the Forest Service does is borrow that money from other accounts.

We sometimes complain that the Forest Service doesn't go out and do the thinning that is necessary or do the restoration that is necessary or do the trail maintenance that is necessary. The reason they can't do it is because we have borrowed all the money to fight wildfires, and we are trying to prevent that wildfire borrowing.

It is one thing to try to prevent it in a manner that will address the problem and another to just say you just can't borrow, because I would hate to be in the situation where we run up against a fire year where we are going to exceed the 10-year average, we run out of firefighting money, and there is no way to get the resources in order to fund the fires that are occurring in the latter part of the year. This would put pressure on for Congress to probably do something.

As you know, there is a challenge with the Budget Committee that we have been working with in trying to address this issue.

There is some language, as I understand it, in the Senate Interior bill dealing with the wildfire-fighting costs and how we handle that. There is some language in a bill that will be before us I think this week, the Healthy Forest bill out of the Resources Committee.

I think more and more people are starting to realize that we have got to address this problem. There is absolutely no reason that wildfires should not be treated as other natural disasters are—hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and other things. But for some reason, we treat wildfires differently, and that doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

So we have had various proposals. I have talked with the administration, with the Department of the Interior, with the Forest Service, and with many other people, trying to come to a resolution on this, and there are many people on both the Republican and the Democratic side of the aisle that are trying to address this.

I am hopeful that we are inching ever closer, because you know things don't move as quickly as we like oftentimes in Congress. We are moving, inching closer, I would hope, to finding the solution to this. There are different ideas out there about how to go about doing exactly what the gentleman from California, myself, and the chairman all want to do, and that is quit the fire borrowing so that the Forest Service can do the job that we appropriate the money for them to do.

Given that this could create some real problems, I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do, but I would have to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members not to traffic the well.

Mr. GARAMENDI. My good friend from Idaho has it right. His bill ought to become law. And you did find a way to fund it: the same way we fund hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and the like—out of FEMA.

□ 2130

Good bill—by the way, I am a coauthor of it. Thank you very much. Only you can prevent forest fires. How many times have we seen Smokey the Bear? Congress can help.

I want to congratulate and I really want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle because you are in a position to lead on this. This amendment is in a position to cause action. That is all it is.

Would we have a disaster? We are going to have a fire disaster; there is no doubt about it.

Would we have a financing disaster? Probably, but we can solve it—we can solve it both with legislation, and then we can solve it with a piece of legislation moving through this House that would reach back to the FEMA money, where we always stack a huge stash of money for the eventuality of a disaster. We would reach back and say: Okay. That is how we are going to do it going forward.

I think it is about time for me to yield. I probably don't have much more time, but I am kind of stirring the pot here. I am trying to kick this into gear, and I am delighted to work with the good language that the chairman of the committee has put into the bill.

Had I the time, I would read, once again, your analysis of the problem and also your analysis of the solution. That is found in, this year, H.R. 167, a fine piece of legislation by an outstanding gentleman from Idaho.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his help on trying to get us to a resolution on this. I am sure, working together, we can solve this problem eventually.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT GRAY WOLVES IN WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND UTAH AS ENDANGERED SPECIES OR THREATENED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Interior or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to treat any gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in Washington, Oregon, or Utah as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from using funds to continue listing the gray wolf under the Endangered Species Act in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Utah.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious issue of extreme importance to my home State of Washington, where the gray wolf is listed in the western two-thirds of the State, but is delisted in the eastern third. This fragmented listing means that there are no geographic barriers to prevent the wolves from traveling between listed and delisted areas, posing a risk to people living, farming, and ranching in the region.

Unfortunately, this issue should already have been settled. In June of 2013, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service published a proposed rule to remove the gray wolf from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act.

The Fish and Wildlife Service made this determination after evaluating this ''classification status of gray wolves currently listed in the contiguous United States'' and found the ''best available science and commercial information indicates that the currently listed entity is not a valid species under the Act.''

On June 30 of this year, the Service released its response to a petition seeking to reclassify all gray wolves in the U.S. as a threatened species under ESA. In its response, the Fish and Wildlife Service states that it determined there was not substantial information to indicate that such a reclassification was warranted, and as a result, the Fish and Wildlife Service will take no further action on the petition.

Furthermore, the statutory purpose of ESA is to recover a species to the point where it is no longer considered endangered or threatened. The gray wolf is currently found in nearly 50 countries around the world, and the wolf specialist group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature has placed the species in the category of ''least concern globally'' for risk of extinction.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed rule and other examples I have cited clearly show that a full delisting of the gray wolf is long overdue. Since wolves were first placed under ESA, uncontrolled and unmanaged growth of gray wolf populations has resulted in devastating impacts on hunting and ranching, as well as tragic losses to historically strong and healthy livestock and wildlife populations.

Mr. Chairman, the gray wolf population has grown substantially across its range and is now considered to be recovered; therefore, it does not merit protection under the Endangered Species Act.

The Pacific Northwest States are fully qualified to responsibly manage their gray wolf populations and are better suited than the Federal Government to meet the needs of local communities, ranchers, livestock, and wildlife populations.

My amendment today is simple. It would take steps that the Fish and Wildlife Service has already said are necessary and are supported by the best available scientific evidence and data. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from eastern Washington, Congresswoman CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, Representative NEWHOUSE, for yielding and for his leadership on this important issue.

Four years ago, when the Federal Government delisted wolves in a portion of the Western United States, what was left behind was a growing wolf population and a confusing checkerboard of regulations.

Wolves do not know regulatory boundaries. When a single forest is divided between two different management plans, local leaders', farmers', and other stakeholders' hands are tied when protecting themselves from a wolf threat and often face unnecessary repercussions.

Washington State proposed a wolf conservation and management plan, but is unable to fully implement it with Federal protections lingering in the western two-thirds of the State.

Our local leaders can manage the resources and wildlife in our State more effectively and efficiently than the Federal Government; but if we want to empower them to protect herds of livestock, people, and lands from other possible threats of wolves, we need a consistent framework for the entire State, not just sections.

For this reason, I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment is yet another attack on a vulnerable icon American species, the gray wolf. The gray wolf is a keystone species that plays a vital role in keeping our ecosystems healthy.

It is also an animal that many Native American cultures feel a kinship bond with. I heard from many tribal leaders that the protections afforded under the Endangered Species Act for gray wolves are the only way that they have been able to keep wolf hunts out of their tribal reservation boundaries.

Now, I understand many of my colleagues have very strong views about listings and delistings affecting their States, but the Endangered Species Act exists to offer necessary protections and ensure a species' survival, which the majority of our constituents strongly support. This is the same law that successfully restored another iconic American species, the bald eagle.

This amendment restricts the Department of the Interior's ability to implement the Endangered Species Act. However, it does not alter the protections for the endangered wolves in these States.

Regardless of one's position on species protection, the amendment is very problematic. The restrictions will ultimately hurt farmers, ranchers, landowners and businessowners.

Here is why: under this amendment, the Fish and Wildlife Service would not be able to offer exemptions or permits for incidental killings of wolves to landowners, ranchers, and other parties who might be in need of them; however, the prohibition against accidental kills or takes would still remain and would still be legally enforceable.

Thus, this constitutes that States would either have to stop any activity—any activity—that led to the taking of a wolf, or they would be vulnerable to a lawsuit or heavy penalties. Simply put, this amendment is bad for wolves; it is bad for our ecosystem; it is bad for business, and it is bad for our constituents.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I just wanted to explain the situation that we find ourselves in.

I am sympathetic with what the gentleman is doing, and when we actually passed language 4 years ago on the wolves in Idaho and Montana, we thought about what happened to the wolves that go into Washington and Oregon and Nevada and Utah and so forth; and we thought about including those in the general delisting. Well, we didn't delist them; the Fish and Wildlife Service did.

We found it created several problems. One, those States didn't have State management plans, which is the case today with most of them because we discussed this, or I discussed this issue earlier with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

What their plan is and what they would like to do is, currently, they support the language that is in the bill that reinstates their delisting in Wyoming and the Great Lakes. Those States have State management plans that have been approved by Fish and Wildlife Service.

If you include the other States that are included in this that don't have the State management plans, then Fish and Wildlife has to oppose what we are doing.

I believe that what their goal is, is to get this language passed dealing with Wyoming, the Great Lakes, and then do a wider, rangewide delisting once those States have State management plans that have been adopted by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and this amendment may undermine that.

This is something that we need to discuss, I think. I am not opposing the gentleman's amendment, but it is something that I think we need to discuss between now and conference so that we get a plan and to make sure that we are not undermining what I think we all want, and that is the ultimate delisting of the gray wolves that have met the standard.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I understand that my colleagues have strong views about this, pro and con, about the listing and delisting; but this amendment is very, very problematic. For that reason, I can't support it.

The gentleman from Idaho is correct. This has so many unintended consequences that I feel very strongly—very strongly—about not supporting this amendment for that reason.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, with the few seconds I have left, I would certainly thank the gentleman from Idaho, as well as the lady from Minnesota, for sharing their concerns.

I certainly look forward to working with my colleagues. I would urge support and look forward to a continuing effort to move this to a conclusion that we can all accept.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Washington will be postponed.

□ 2145

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

None of the funds made available by this Act for California drought response or relief may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Secretary of the Interior in contravention of implementation of Division 26.7 of the California Water Code (the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014), as approved by the voters of California in California Proposition 1 (2014).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, despite the potential for a point of order and the amendment being out of order, it really, really is a good policy. While it may not come to a vote on this House floor, it certainly ought to come to the attention of the appropriators and the administration that we have got a pretty serious drought in the West. It does affect California, Arizona, Oregon, probably parts of Idaho, and on into New Mexico.

California voters last November passed a $7 billion water bond that deals with the long-term issues of the water supply in California and some of the immediate challenges that the California drought has brought to the 30-plus million citizens of the State.

This amendment would direct the Department of the interior, the EPA, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Defense to focus the money that it would be spending in California under any circumstance, to focus that money on assisting, augmenting, advancing, and supplementing those programs that the State of California is undertaking to address the drought using the bond act money.

That is a great idea, that instead of spending the money on things that are not immediately relevant, that are not immediately necessary and do not immediately help those citizens of California, those communities, those agencies in the State that are suffering from the drought, rather to spend the money on those programs. That is it.

It doesn't call for any additional money. It doesn't really cause long-term problems to our appropriation processes, but, rather, it says, hey, we have got a problem. Let's focus on the problem, and let's coordinate with the State of California in solving the problem. That is it, pretty simple stuff.

Unfortunately, I guess we may have a point of order, and this rather important concept won't be in the legislation.

However, I do think that the administration is aware, and they are beginning to focus appropriately on the drought in California. And I would hope in other States, just as we are suggesting they do here, that they, the administration and the Federal Government, focus the money that it would otherwise be spending in the State of California and in these other States on projects that the local governments, the State governments in those States are undertaking to address the drought—pretty basic.

So that I might challenge the point of order, I will reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order and make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

The amendment requires a new determination, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Idaho was so right and is now so wrong. But that is the way it is. When you have got the votes, you have got the votes.

Nevertheless, this is really a very, very good program. I would encourage all of us—and particularly the administration—to follow along the policies here; and I would point out that they are.

So I challenge the point of order and would ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of whether certain actions will contravene a specified State law.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue any regulation under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) that applies to an animal feeding operation, including a concentrated animal feeding operation and a large concentrated animal feeding operation, as such terms are defined in section 122.23 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment on an issue that is critical to livestock producers not just in my State and in my district, but across the whole country.

Last year, a group of folks in my area, environmental activists, sued several dairies in the Yakima Valley in Washington State, claiming that the dairies were responsible for ''open dumping'' under the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976—or, as it is most commonly referred to, RCRA—because of manure storage and management issues on their farms.

The big issue is what law the activists were suing the dairies under. There are many laws and regulations, both at the State and Federal level, which are appropriate mechanisms for protecting and ensuring our Nation's waters are kept clean, but the problem I see is that RCRA is not one of them.

RCRA was a law designed to govern solid wastes and prevent open dumping. The major application of this law is regulating landfills. It was never intended to regulate animal waste. In fact, the EPA, in its initial 1979 regulations for RCRA, expressed that the law ''does not apply to agricultural waste, including manure and crop residue, returned to the soil as fertilizers or soil conditioners.''

I don't know how much clearer we can get that manure storage and handling were not intended to be governed under this law. Unfortunately, though, a Federal judge in Spokane, Washington, agreed with the group and stretched the definition of ''solid waste'' to apply to manure nitrates, contrary to the law and Federal regulatory code, and held the dairies responsible for open dumping because of how they stored and handled animal waste.

Mr. Chair, my amendment does nothing to prevent EPA from enforcing the current regulations under RCRA. It does nothing to change the Clean Water Act rulemakings, nor does it prevent EPA from issuing or enforcing Clean Water Act regulations. All my amendment does is prevent EPA from issuing and expanding new regulations under RCRA that would reflect the interpretation of this current law.

Mr. Chair, no one is saying that livestock producers—like every American—don't share in the responsibility of good stewardship of our environment

and our resources. They certainly do. But there are appropriate laws and regulations intended to govern this, and there are ones that are not appropriate for this purpose.

Simply piling additional layers of regulation on producers and giving activists new litigation tools to target our Nation's farmers and ranchers is not what Congress had in mind when passing the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act. We, as Congress, have a responsibility to make that clarification, and that is what I am seeking to do with this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would be better able to comment on this amendment if the gentleman had shared a copy. In this day and age, I am glad we are allowed to bring an iPad on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Washington when he decided upon this amendment. Has it been in the last 20 minutes, or was it 2 hours ago?

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. It was, let's see, more like 6 hours ago that it was in the hopper.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The headlines are, groundbreaking rule in Washington State on this dairy case. And it is, ''Dairy Pollution Threatens Washington Valley's Water.'' This was a big enough story, in fact, that it was even reprinted by the Minneapolis Star Tribune. It was the first time that the Federal Resources Conservation Recovery Act was used to consider ways in which land and water had to be protected.

So, Mr. Chairman, just because I didn't have an opportunity to really delve into this and find out more about it—and what the amendment does is it just totally stops funds to be issued under this regulation to animal feeding operations—I am going to oppose it because it also includes large concentrated animal feeding operations. And I do come from a farming State, so I do know the difference between a small farm, a small hog farmer, and a lagoon, and large dairy farms and small dairy farms. So with that, I oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I am not questioning the good lady's credentials from the farming State of Minnesota. But certainly given time, as this process moves forward, she will become intimately familiar with this law as it is being interpreted. It is already happening in other parts of the country, and I would offer this amendment to help preclude the wrongful use of the law and ask my colleagues for strong consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I will just read into the RECORD from January 15, 2015, Spokane, Washington:

> A Federal judge has ruled that a large industrial dairy in eastern Washington has polluted drinking water through its application, storage, and management of manure in a case that could set precedents across the Nation.
>
> U.S. District Judge Thomas O. Rice of Spokane ruled Wednesday that the pollution posed an ''imminent and substantial endangerment'' to the environment and to people who drink the water.
>
> Rice wrote that he ''could come to no other conclusion than that the dairy's operations are contributing to the high levels of nitrate that are currently contaminating—and will continue to contaminate . . . the underlying groundwater.''
>
> ''Any attempt to diminish the dairy's contribution to the nitrate contamination is disingenuous, at best,'' Rice wrote in the 111-page opinion, in which he granted partial summary judgment in favor of environmental groups that sued the dairy.

These environmental groups are people who are looking out for their drinking water. So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2200

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill before the short title, insert the following:
>
> LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the committee, both the staff and the gentlewoman from Minnesota, the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from Idaho who are now managing this appropriations bill.

I call this the good health appropriations for the quality of life of many Americans, both urban and rural. I ask my colleagues to consider my amendment, which deals with the urban reforestation program. I live close and personal to both urban areas and rural areas in my congressional district.

Given close to 80 percent of the population of the conterminous United States lives in an urban area, the benefits provided by urban forests touch most U.S. citizens. My amendment specifically reinforces the importance of urban reforestation, as well as preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children.

I offered these amendments in years past. I know it from a real-time experience. Over the last couple of years, when the drought hit Houston and many other areas in Texas, millions of trees were lost. Millions of trees were lost.

Today, now, we face the large and very challenging effort of trying to reforest parks like Memorial Park, MacGregor Park, and many parks in the northeast part of my district. In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all of our urban trees, a loss of over 600 million trees.

I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation. In fact, many Members will remember that throughout our careers, we have been involved in planting of trees. There are major efforts throughout our community.

I want to cite, for example, those who have worked in Houston, Texas, doing the reforestation work: Houston Wilderness, Student Conservation Association, the Buffalo Bayou Partnership, the Greater East End Management District, Houston Parks and Recreation Department, and Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, along with many civic clubs of which I have had the privilege of working with.

Several years ago, American Forests, a leading conservation group, estimated that the tree-covered loss in the greater Washington metropolitan area from 1973 to 1997 resulted in an additional 540 million cubic feet of storm water runoff annually, which would have taken more than 1 billion in storm water control facilities to manage.

We know that the green effect in the middle of the city can have a beneficial effect on a community's health, both physically and psychologically. A healthy 32-foot-tall ash tree can produce about 260 pounds of oxygen annually.

Trees help reduce pollution. Trees help combat the effects of greenhouse gases. Trees help cool down the overall city environment by shading asphalt, concrete, and metal surfaces. Buildings and paving in city centers create a heat island effect. A mature tree canopy reduces air temperatures by about 5 to 10 degrees.

Let me give a personal story on the importance of reforestation. A few years ago, I helped create a memorial plaza for a Martin Luther King monument in MacGregor Park. There was a tree of life that was presented to that park by Martin Luther King's father.

In the course of urban development, that tree had to be moved. It caused an emotional uprising in our community. Ovide Duncantell tied himself to the tree.

Ultimately, we resolved that the tree had to be moved, and that tree was potentially a tree that would die. With the right kind of nurturing and reforestation and treatment by the foresters who came, that tree is now a shining example of a unified community.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment to ensure that our programs dealing with urban reforestation continue.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 2822, the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act of 2016 and to commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment emphasizes the importance of urban forests, and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children.

Identical amendments were offered and accepted in the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for Fiscal Year 2008 (H.R. 2643) and Fiscal Year 2007 (H.R. 5386), and were adopted by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, surveys indicate that some urban forests are in serious danger.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30% of all our urban trees—a loss of over 600 million trees.

Eighty percent (80%) of the American population lives in the dense quarters of a city.

Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to a concrete area that can help to remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in storm water management costs.

I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation.

In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increase property value of surrounding real estate.

Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and/or deterioration.

Mr. Chair, a real commitment to enhancing our environment involves both the protection of existing natural resources and active support for restoration and improvement projects.

Several years ago, American Forests, a leading conservation group, estimated that the tree cover lost in the greater Washington metropolitan area from 1973 to 1997 resulted in an additional 540 million cubic feet of storm water runoff annually, which would have taken more than $1 billion in storm water control facilities to manage.

Trees breathe in carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen.

People breathe in oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide.

A typical person consumes about 38 lb of oxygen per year.

A healthy tree, say a 32 ft tall ash tree, can produce about 260 lb of oxygen annually—two trees supply the oxygen needs of a person for a year.

Trees help reduce pollution by capturing particulates like dust and pollen with their leaves.

A mature tree absorbs from 120 to 240 lbs of the small particles and gases of air pollution.

Trees help combat the effects of "greenhouse" gases, the increased carbon dioxide produced from burning fossil fuels that is causing our atmosphere to "heat up."

Trees help cool down the overall city environment by shading asphalt, concrete and metal surfaces.

Buildings and paving in city centers create a heat-island effect.

A mature tree canopy reduces air temperatures by about 5–10 degrees Fahrenheit.

A 25 foot tree reduces annual heating and cooling costs of a typical residence by 8 to 12 percent, producing an average annual savings of $120 per American household.

Proper tree plantings around buildings can slow winter winds, and reduce annual energy use for home heating by 4–22%.

Mr. Chair, trees play a vital role in making our cities more sustainable and more livable.

The Jackson Lee amendment simply provides for continued support to programs that reforest our urban areas.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this legislation.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson Lee amendment.

It was very interesting to learn more about what your goals and objectives are, and I think it is very worthy of our consideration.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by simply saying what a great difference life will be in many urban areas with our commitment to reforestation of urban areas and creating more opportunities for trees to grow in those areas.

I ask for support of the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YODER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE THREATENED SPECIES LISTING OF THE LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Kansas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today would prohibit further waste of Federal funds from being used to enforce the unnecessary listing of the lesser prairie chicken as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

Now, this listing has Americans crying foul in Kansas and all across the country over the burden it places on farmers, ranchers, and agriculture producers. This misguided listing comes at a time when the lesser prairie chicken is actually becoming the greater prairie chicken, in some respects, gaining in population significantly each of the last several years.

Less than 1 week ago, a new population count for the lesser prairie chicken was released, and it shows a 25 percent increase in the species population over the last year. That follows a 20 percent increase from the year before.

What is to account for all this? Is it the listing on the endangered species list? No—these population increases, according to experts, are attributed to improved habitat conditions, as a result of increased rainfall to an area that had previously been experiencing one of the worst droughts since the infamous Dust Bowl.

Now, not a single drop of this rainfall can be attributed to the central planners in Washington, D.C., nor can this listing have any effect on making it rain in places like Kansas.

We need to let State and local municipalities and States work together to create these conservation plans to help produce the populations we need for the lesser prairie chicken.

In fact, five States with habitat areas—Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado—already have a locally driven, areawide plan in place known as the lesser prairie chicken rangewide conservation plan. It has broad stakeholder support to conserve and replenish the lesser prairie chicken population.

Now, we have an opportunity today, as Democrats and Republicans, to flock together, to break out of our shells, to work with States and localities and delist the lesser prairie chicken.

Keeping it in place makes it harder on hard-working farmers to grow crops and feed our Nation, and it makes it harder for energy producers to produce renewable or traditional energy.

All of that increases the cost at the grocery store or at the pump for average everyday working Americans. This cost of the listing is having little to no impact; this is while the cost of this listing has little to no impact on the ever-growing population.

That growth is coming from States and localities working hand in hand with farmers and producers; yet, as these ineffective Federal burdens go up, so does the cost of doing business in America. Now, that is truly something to crow about.

Let's work together. Let's let States recoup and conserve and grow the lesser prairie chicken populations, and let's pass this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act and would restrict the Fish and Wildlife Service from offering any critical protections to preserve the species.

This amendment is harmful and misguided and maybe a little scrambled, as in some eggs. Once the species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of Fish and Wildlife is primarily permissive, helping parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

Under this amendment, all the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. They would still apply, the Endangered Species Act prohibitions, but landowners would have no avenue to comply with them.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would be barred from issuing permits or exemptions. This means landowners, industry, and other parties who might need to take the lesser prairie chicken incidentally to do their otherwise lawful activities, such as oil and gas development, would be vulnerable to a citizens lawsuit.

Additionally, this amendment would halt an innovative plan to conserve the lesser prairie chicken. In 2014, Fish and Wildlife, in partnership with States and local stakeholders, began the implementation of a lesser prairie chicken rangewide conservation plan. That encouraged participants to gain in proactive and voluntary conservation activities, promoting lesser prairie chicken conservation.

The plan describes a locally controlled and an innovative approach for maintaining the State's authority to conserve the species and allows for economic development to continue in a seamless manner. It sounds like a win-win to me, with Fish and Wildlife partnering with local partners and with the State.

This plan prevents significant regulatory delays in obtaining taking permits, disruption to economic activities vital to the State and national interests, and little incentive for conservation habitat on prairie lands.

Sadly, the gentleman's amendment would undermine this plan that local folks and the State came up with to be more collaborative in a conservation effort. This amendment would create uncertainty for landowners, making them vulnerable, as I said earlier, to lawsuits.

We should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to work with local community leaders and to work with the States, not blocking the agency for doing their job.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from western Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), my friend and colleague.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to cosponsor this commonsense amendment as we work to stop the Federal Government from enforcing the ill-advised listing of the lesser prairie chicken.

As a fifth-generation farmer and possibly the only Member on the floor who has actually seen the real-life bird on a family farm that we are talking about, I am strongly opposed to this listing.

As was mentioned, this listing occurred during a massive, historical multiyear drought in my home area in my region and State, which obviously limits habitat growth and reduces the numbers of prairie chickens.

The best solution is for it to rain; and that, it has. Thank you, Lord, though I fully expect the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to take credit for the resulting increase in the lesser prairie chicken population.

For the last 4 years, I have heard from farmers, ranchers, homebuilders, energy producers, and other small businesses concerned about what this listing would do to our rural economy. Our farmers and ranchers are in a state of uncertainty as to whether certain farming and conservation practices, like we have in my own farm, will result in fines or perhaps even jail time. Many energy producers have stopped drilling new wells for fear of risking the consequences of the listing.

Unless Congress does something and does it soon, this threat to our rural economy will probably continue forever. In 40 years of the Endangered Species Act, more than 1,350 species have been listed as endangered, but only 24 have been delisted, and that is just 1.7 percent—not very successful, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these concerns with you, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, support our farmers and ranchers, and support common sense.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kansas has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am sympathetic to the gentleman's concerns, particularly because my home State of California probably has more than its fair share of endangered species problem.

The Endangered Species Act hinges upon the principle that, if a species is listed, that it will be recovered and management will return to the States. This push by the States is the reality we see playing out. Bats, wolves, greater sage-grouse, delta smelt, the list goes on and on and on.

It should come as no surprise, then, to see the States pushing back through their elected Representatives in the legislative branch in an effort to bring the Endangered Species Act back into balance.

I would support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I understand that there is a concern with the listings; and I hear that very loud and clear from my colleagues.

The problem with the way that these amendments have been drafted, particularly in line with this amendment, again, all the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply.

Landowners would have no avenue to comply with because they wouldn't have a partner in the Fish and Wildlife because Fish and Wildlife would be barred from issuing any permits or any exemptions.

Clearly, it means landowners, industries, and other parties who might need to take a lesser prairie chicken incidentally to their otherwise lawful activities will be vulnerable to a lawsuit. Additionally, this amendment will halt any innovation plan to conserve the lesser prairie chicken.

The gentleman's amendment, by undermining collaborative efforts and, I believe, with an amendment that creates uncertainty for landowners making them vulnerable to lawsuits, should be an amendment that should be opposed.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2215

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, again, let me offer my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Minnesota, the gentleman from California, and their staff who have worked with us.

Let me remind my colleagues that just a few days ago, I offered this amendment dealing with museums and dealing with my concern for the funding and the Smithsonian, to provide for the Nation's museum.

Let me also say to my colleagues that I have offered this amendment in the past because I have a particular interest in the museums of America and their ability to do outreach. I imagine I am not alone standing here amongst appropriators to again say and call for the end of sequestration to be able to provide the appropriators and to provide the people of America the full funding to address these quality of life issues from the various lands and Federal parks and, as well, the historic trails, of which I will talk about, but museums, urban reforestation, all elements of the beauty of this Nation. And I frankly believe that museums, likewise, are that form of beauty.

My amendment specifically says: ''None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.''

In order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission, the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the Smithsonian seeks to serve an even greater audience by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amounts of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

Our museums of the Nation are in trouble. The Smithsonian has a beautiful array of museums that are here that millions of Americans have the opportunity to visit. But the outreach program serves millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 States through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions, and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures and presentations, training programs, and Web sites.

Allow me to mention just a few in my own district:

The Holocaust Museum, unique in its presentation of a horrible time in history, but it also serves as a very unifying entity in our community;

The Children's Museum, as one of the original board members and founders, now the Children's Museum is one of the major children's museums in the Nation. But again, it needs the impact of the outreach of the Smithsonian;

And then, of course, the Museum of African American Culture, headed by a dear friend, but also a champion of holding this museum together, and that is John Guess. He needs a fuller embrace by the Smithsonian, including its expertise, its experts, its Ph.D.s, traveling efforts, and again, its encouragement of corporate communities to recognize the value of participating in museums.

The Smithsonian's outreach activities include the Smithsonian Institution traveling exhibition, the Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies, National Science Resources Center, the Smithsonian Institution Press, the Office of Fellowships, and the Smithsonian Associates.

Who are we if we do not value preserving those items that tell the varied and diverse history of America, the good history of America, the history that is unifying and purposeful in citing us as a country that recognizes our wonderful diversity?

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment that deals specifically with allowing the outreach to the kinds of museums that really need the help of the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian, in concluding, Mr. Chairman, is very important to urban areas and rural areas alike, and its ability or its affiliation is to build a strong national network of museums and educational organizations in order to establish active and engaging relationships with communities throughout the country.

Again, allow me to salute, in particular, John Guess, with the Museum of African American Culture in Houston. He has literally put that museum together, along with his board members.

The Smithsonian—I hope they are hearing me as I am talking on the floor of the House—we need your help in Houston, Texas. We probably need your help in Washington State, in California, Minnesota, New York, and beyond to preserve and help these small museums throughout the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support not only this amendment, but the museums of this Nation.

And I say to Mr. CALVERT, we had discussed this before. This amendment now is a placeholder, hopefully, for our discussion going forward dealing with the preservation of our museums.

Let me thank Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 2822, the ''Interior and Environment Appropriations Act of 2016.''

Let me also thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums, including the Air and Space Museum; the Museum of African Art; the Museum of the American Indian; and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Smithsonian also operates another national treasure: the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply provides that:

''Sec. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.''

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered to the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for FY2008 (H.R. 2643) that was approved by voice vote on June 26, 2007.

Mr. Chair, the Smithsonian's outreach programs bring Smithsonian scholars in art, history and science out of ''the nation's attic'' and into their own backyard.

Each year, millions of Americans visit the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.

But in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission, ''the increase and diffusion of knowledge,'' the Smithsonian seeks to serve an even greater audience by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach programs serve millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 states, through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions, and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures and presentations, training programs, and websites.

Smithsonian outreach programs work in close cooperation with Smithsonian museums and research centers, as well as with 144 affiliate institutions and others across the nation.

The Smithsonian's outreach activities support community-based cultural and educational organizations around the country.

They ensure a vital, recurring, and high-impact Smithsonian presence in all 50 states through the provision of traveling exhibitions and a network of affiliations.

Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences (African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and new American) and provide kindergarten through college-age museum education and outreach opportunities.

These outreach programs enhance K–12 science education programs, facilitate the Smithsonian's scholarly interactions with students and scholars at universities, museums, and other research institutions; and disseminate results related to the research and collections strengths of the Institution.

The programs that provide the critical mass of Smithsonian outreach activity are:

1. the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Services (SITES);
2. the Smithsonian Affiliations, the Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies (SCEMS);
3. National Science Resources Center (NSRC);
4. the Smithsonian Institution Press (SIP);
5. the Office of Fellowships (OF); and
6. the Smithsonian Associates (TSA), which receives no federal funding.

To achieve the goal of increasing pubic engagement, SITES directs some of its federal resources to develop Smithsonian Across America: A Celebration of National Pride.

This ''mobile museum,'' which will feature Smithsonian artifacts from the most iconic (presidential portraits, historical American flags, Civil War records, astronaut uniforms, etc.) to the simplest items of everday life (family quilts, prairie schoolhouse furnishings, historical lunch boxes, multilingual store front and street signs, etc.), has been a long-standing organizational priority of the Smithsonian.

SITES ''mobile museum'' is the only traveling exhibit format able to guarantee audience growth and expanded geographic distribution during sustained periods of economic retrenchment, but also because it is imperative for the many exhibitors nationwide who are struggling financially yet eager to participate in Smithsonian outreach.

For communities still struggling to fully recover from the economic downturn, the ability of museums to present temporary exhibitions, the ''mobile museum'' promises to answer an ever-growing demand for Smithsonian shows in the field.

A single, conventional SITES exhibit can reach a maximum of 12 locations over a two- to three-year period.

In contrast, a ''mobile museum'' exhibit can visit up to three venues per week in the course of only one year, at no cost to the host institution or community.

The net result is an increase by 150 in the number of outreach locations to which SITES shows can travel annually.

And in addition to its flexibility in making short-term stops in cities and towns from coast-to-coast, a ''mobile museum'' has the advantage of being able to frequent the very locations where people live, work, and take part in leisure time activities.

By establishing an exhibit presence in settings like these, SITES will not only increase its annual visitor participation by 1 million, but also advance a key Smithsonian performance objective: to develop exhibit approaches that address diverse audiences, including population groups not always affiliated with mainstream cultural institutions.

SITES also will be the public exhibitions' face of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, as that new Museum comes online.

Providing national access to projects that will introduce the American public to the Museum's mission, SITES in FY 2008 will tour such stirring exhibitions as NASA ART: 50 Years of Exploration; 381 Days: The Montgomery Bus Boycott Story; Beyond: Visions of Planetary Landscapes; The Way We Worked: Photographs from the National Archives; and More Than Words: Illustrated Letters from the Smithsonian's Archives of American Art.

To meet the growing demand among smaller community and ethnic museums for an exhibition celebrating the Latino experience, SITES provided a scaled-down version of the National Museum of American History's 4,000-square-foot exhibition about legendary entertainer Celia Cruz.

Two 1,500-square-foot exhibitions, one about Crow Indian history and the other on basket traditions, will give Smithsonian visitors beyond Washington a taste of the Institution's critically acclaimed National Museum of the American Indian.

Two more exhibits, ''In Plane View'' and ''Earth from Space,'' provided visitors an opportunity to experience the Smithsonian's recently opened, expansive National Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center.

For almost 30 years, The Smithsonian Associates—the highly regarded educational arm of the Smithsonian Institution—has arranged Scholars in the Schools programs.

Through this tremendously successful and well-received educational outreach program, the Smithsonian shares its staff—hundreds of experts in art, history and science—with the national community at a local level.

The mission of Smithsonian Affiliations is to build a strong national network of museums and educational organizations in order to establish active and engaging relationships with communities throughout the country.

There are currently 138 affiliates located in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Panama.

By working with museums of diverse subject areas and scholarly disciplines, both emerging and well-established, Smithsonian Affiliations is building partnerships through which audiences and visitors everywhere will be able to share in the great wealth of the Smithsonian while building capacity and expertise in local communities.

The National Science Resources Center (NSRC) strives to increase the number of ethnically diverse students participating in effective science programs based on NSRC products and services.

The Center develops and implements a national outreach strategy that will increase the number of school districts (currently more than 800) that are implementing NSRC K–8 programs.

The NSRC is striving to further enhance its program activity with a newly developed scientific outreach program introducing communities and school districts to science through literacy initiatives.

In addition, through the building of the multicultural Alliance Initiative, the Smithsonian's outreach programs seek to develop new approaches to enable the public to gain access to Smithsonian collections, research, education, and public programs that reflect the diversity of the American people, including underserved audiences of ethnic populations and persons with disabilities.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Director of the National Park Service to implement, administer, or enforce Policy Memorandum 11–03 or to approve a request by a park superintendent to eliminate the sale in National Parks of water in disposable plastic bottles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

This summer, thousands of Americans will load the kids into the car and set out on a trip to visit one of our country's historic national parks.

Whether it is to see the stunning valleys of the Grand Canyon or the towering stone faces etched into Mt. Rushmore, tens of millions of families arrive at national park destinations each year.

As some may know, the National Park Service has implemented a policy allowing parks to ban the sale of bottled water, and only bottled water, at park concessions. I understand that the Park Service is concerned about waste left behind by visitors. We all agree that protecting our national parks is a laudable goal. However, banning the sale of bottled water is not the best way to go about it.

In blocking the sale of bottled water at our parks, we are depriving millions of Americans access to a healthy and necessary beverage that park visitors rely on. This is especially true in the hot summer months.

Families who don't own expensive camping equipment and aren't experienced hikers and climbers will be surprised to find out that they can't buy their child a bottle of water at one of our national parks. Nineteen national parks have adopted or plan to adopt a bottled water ban. This includes the Grand Canyon National Park. Temperatures at the Grand Canyon just this week will top 100 degrees. Visitors who may have forgotten or have run out of water could be put at risk of dehydration.

Banning bottled water defies common sense. Even the Park Service admits that the ban ''could affect visitor safety'' and ''eliminates the healthiest choice for bottled drinks, leaving sugary drinks as a primary alternative.''

The policy runs counter to the Park Service's own Healthy Parks Healthy People initiative, which urges visitors to make healthy food choices because, remember, bottled water, and only bottled water, is banned from being sold at concessions.

Some argue that the ban is necessary to reduce waste. But the National Park Service has confirmed that participating parks haven't been able to determine if the policy works. To start, we know parks don't separately analyze recycled waste visitors leave behind. Parks simply can't say whether the ban has worked.

It is also worth noting that studies conducted on similar water bans show that they aren't effective in reducing waste. A study in the American Journal of Public Health found the bottled water bans on college campuses had unintended consequences. Eliminating bottled water did not, in fact, reduce waste, but actually led to a spike in sales and increased shipments of packaged beverages.

Mr. Chairman, we all support efforts to protect our parks. All we ask today is that the National Park Service carefully consider its policies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to work with the gentleman on this issue because I think he raises some concerns which do need to be addressed.

I would just kind of like to set the picture about what is currently going on right now. There are 407 units in the National Park system, and only 19 of them—19 of them—have elected to eliminate the sale of water in disposable plastic bottles.

It is important to note that in the National Park system units, including these 19, visitors are still free to bring water in with them and use water in disposable plastic bottles. They are not banned from bringing in their own water.

The use of these disposable water bottles has had a significant environmental impact on the National Park system units. That is why I would like to work with the gentleman and figure out what we need to do about waste reduction in our parks and if this was part of the Park's overall system on it, and the sugary drinks that the gentleman referred to, if those bottles are also a potential problem, or how do we educate and work with families and hikers and vacationers and visitors to our national parks about not leaving this waste out in the open.

Another example, in Grand Canyon Park, disposable bottles compromise nearly 20 percent of the Grand Canyon's waste stream and 30 percent of the park's recyclables.

So before eliminating bottle water sales, the National Park system units were required to undertake an extensive review process considering 14 different factors before seeking approval from the regional director. This extensive review process included rigorous impact analysis, including assessment of the effects on visitors' health and safety.

Once approved, these park units are required to maintain an extensive public education program that provides readily available designed water bottle refilling stations. And in many places that I visited recently, I have seen both the ability to purchase as well as refill, at our national parks, water bottles.

So as a leader in conservation, the National Park Service encourages recycling in the reduction of plastic disposable water bottles. My concern would be we wouldn't want your amendment—and I will speak for myself. I don't want to be part of undercutting any of those efforts to encourage recycling in the reduction of disposable water bottles.

I would also be concerned that the park system eliminated water sales without having a viable alternative, as the gentleman pointed out, but that does not appear to be the case here. As I noted earlier, there is an extensive review process, and these park units are required to offer readily available free water refilling stations. Plus, people are still free to bring in water themselves.

I would very much like to work with the gentleman and the chairman to see if there are any refinements or if there is anything that we need to know more about what the National Park system's policy on plastic water bottles is. But I do not support an outright prohibition on the National Park Service to be able to carry out a policy that encourages the reuse and the reduction of plastic water bottles in our parks and in our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my colleague from Pennsylvania's amendment.

As a nurse, I know the key component of staying healthy is being hydrated and drinking plenty of water. However, if you were to be in one of our Nation's parks, you might find this difficult.

Why?

Because the National Park Service allows individual parks to ban bottled water from their premises. Yet, in those same parks, someone can still purchase soda and other bottled beverages.

□ 2230

Mr. Chairman, this ban is misguided. While it was created in an attempt to reduce litter in the parks, it has, instead, served as a primary example of intrusive government overreach—something this country certainly needs less of and something my constituents sent me here to Washington to prevent.

According to the National Park's Sustainable Practices report, parks that have implemented this ban are not actually reporting any useful data on recycling by type. In other words, they don't know if this ban is effectively working or not. Preserving the beauty of our parks is a noble goal and is something we should all care about, but it should not come at the expense of consumer choice.

Mr. Chairman, we should support freedom; we should support the beauty of our parks; and we should support good, healthy lifestyles for every American. However, the current ban in place does none of the above. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure as it stops this ineffective ban.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to the speakers and to the chairman of the subcommittee, I hear the concerns. If there are concerns to be addressed, I want to be a partner in that, but I also don't want to be part in party of walking back—reducing waste in our streams and not in any way, shape or form, adding to the costs of Park Service rangers and volunteers in their having to go out and clean up plastic bottles, plastic water caps, and other such things.

I am sincere in my efforts in saying I would like very much to work with my colleagues on this issue, but I did not hear anybody saying that they wanted to work back. So, at this point, I will oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for the convenience of consumers and also in light of the fact that studies show that it is not having an impact.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am more than happy to work with my good friend from Minnesota as we move this process forward.

As you know, we talked about this in the budget process with the National Park Service earlier in the year. We, obviously, don't want to discourage people from drinking water. We want them to stay hydrated. There are also people who work in the bottled water industry, and I think it is a noble industry. We want to encourage people to drink more water. It is not just about bottled water. It is about jobs and about the people who bottle that water.

I will work together with the gentlewoman from Minnesota, and we will not deny people water in our national parks. I support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION'' may be used in contravention of section 320101 of title 54, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise with my appreciation to the managers of this bill and their staffs; but I also want to thank them for the very civil discussion that occurred earlier by two of my colleagues who offered amendments regarding the exhibition of Civil War artifacts, or the rebel flag, and I thank them for their courtesy in those amendments of those individuals.

I also make a statement on the floor that I look forward to the opportunity given to us by the leadership of this House to have a full discussion on various entities that did not unify but divide, and I think a civil debate on this is warranted in this House as we watched the very moving and very honest debate that took place in South Carolina.

My amendment, however, is one that, I hope, is embracing and is a show of unity about what America stands for,

and that is the National Heritage Area-Corridor designation. I just want to show this map, and I am certainly quite pleased that a number of these National Heritage Areas do exist. There are 49 of them—none in the State of Texas, none but possibly one in Minnesota, maybe one between Arizona and California, but very few in the West, including in the State of Idaho, and I can name a number of other States.

My amendment is to highlight the value of these national trails. This is particularly important because this tells the story of America. 16 U.S. Code 461 provides that: ''It is declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.'' Again, I want to emphasize that—the inspiration.

Texas has, starting in Galveston, history referring to the Emancipation Proclamation. We commemorate something called Juneteenth, and out of Juneteenth was the time when Captain Granger came to the shores of Galveston, in Texas, and announced that the slaves had been freed. However, there are a number of other historic sites following the trail from Galveston through Houston to include Emancipation Park, MacGregor Park, and then sites going up through Austin.

We really understand that this idea of historic trails can create an economic impact. For example, in 2012, a nationally respected consulting firm completed a comprehensive economic impact of six national historic sites in the northeast region that also included an extrapolation of the economic benefit of all 49 NHAs. It was $12.9 billion.

The study quantified the economic impact of the individual NHAs and based it upon a case study approach and found that the economic impact of three National Historic Areas in Arizona, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania showed: in Massachusetts, $153.8 million in economic impact, 1,832 jobs, and generates $14.3 million in tax revenue; in Pennsylvania, $21.2 million in economic impact, 314 jobs, and generates $1.5 million in tax revenue; in the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area in Arizona, $22.7 million in economic impact, supports 277 jobs, and generates $1.3 million in tax revenue.

This is, Mr. Chairman, an important and very vital part of America's history, and as we approach the anniversary of this legislation that was created in 1966, I think it is important to reinforce the ability for these particular sites. We need to increase the ability for feasibility studies; we need the support of legislative action and designation; and we need to be able to introduce people to the importance of these sites.

Let me make very quick mention of the emancipation part. In 1872, in Houston, four former slaves raised $800. That would be part of it, but I would just simply say that this is a very important part of America's history.

I ask my colleagues to support the creation of a national heritage site across America by supporting the Jackson Lee amendment so that we can expand the 49 sites to other States that do not have one single site, and Texas is one of them.

Mr. Chair, Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of the Jackson Lee amendment and to commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill to floor.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Most Americans do not know that this bill also funds a very special program, the National Recreation and Preservation.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee Amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment provides:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act for the ''DEPARTMENT 0F THE INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION'' may be used in contravention of section 461 of title 16, United States Code.

And 16 U.S. Code 461 provides that:

It is declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

This is important, especially as it relates to National Heritage Areas (NHAs).

NHAs both preserve our national heritage and provide economic benefits to communities and regions through their commitments to heritage conservation and economic development.

Through public-private partnerships, NHA entities support historic preservation, natural resource conservation, recreation, heritage tourism, and educational projects.

Leveraging funds and long-term support for projects, NHA partnerships generate increased economic impact for regions in which they are located.

In 2012, a nationally respected consulting firm (Tripp Umbach) completed a comprehensive economic impact study of six NHA sites in the Northeast Region that also included an extrapolation of the economic benefit of all 49 NHA sites on the national economy.

The annual economic impact was estimated to be 12.9 billion.

The economic activity supports approximately 148,000 jobs and generates $1.2 billion annually in Federal revenues from sources such as employee compensation, proprietor income, indirect business tax, households, and corporation.

The study quantified the economic impacts of individual NHAs based upon a case study approach and found that the economic impact of the three National Historic Areas in Arizona, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania showed:

1. Essex National Heritage Area (MA) generates $153.8 million in econonic impact, supports 1,832 jobs, and generates $14.3 million in tax revenue.

2. Oil Region National Heritage Area (PA) generates $21.2 million in economic impact, supports 314 jobs, and generates $1.5 million tax revenue; and

3. Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (AZ) $22.7 million in economic impact, supports 277 jobs, and generates $1.3 million in tax revenue.

Mr. Chair, as I said there are 49 NHA across the nation but, surprisingly, none in my state of Texas.

We hope to rectify this in the not too distant future.

Texas is the largest and second most populous state in the nation and has a unique story in American history with its diverse geographic landscape, natural resources, and population.

From Galveston's port, East Texas' farms and forestry, and the Buffalo Soldiers, Texas has a rich multi-cultured heritage and history.

To honor Texas' heritage, I will be working with my colleagues to establish a National Heritage Area Corridor designation that stretches across historically significant and landmark sites from Galveston to Houston and East Texas into Central Texas.

This cultural corridor would focus on historic, cultural and natural sites, as well as roadways, businesses, residential and farm districts that unite Texas' rich heritage from the first settlers to modern times.

Mr. Chair, as we approach the anniversary of the passage of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, we want to preserve and unite the legacy stories of some of our state's most revered sites.

Currently underway in Houston is the revitalization of the historic Emancipation Park, a pivotal site in the state's social and cultural development and African American legacy.

The future Emancipation Park, if brought to fruition and designated as a part of a National Heritage Corridor, represents a unique opportunity to tell a comprehensive story about the great State of Texas.

To conclude, National Heritage Areas (NHAs) are both a good investment and national treasure providing economic benefits to communities and regions through their commitment to heritage conservation and economic development.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their work in putting together this legislation.

THE CREATION OF A NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR FOR EMANCIPATION PARK AND SURROUNDING HISTORIC SITES IN TEXAS:

I.) Why a National Heritage Corridor:

1. Opportunity to share the unique story of Emancipation Park

In 1872, four former slaves raised $800.00 to purchase 10 acres of land as a gathering place to celebrate their new found freedom. This land has played a prominent role in America's rich cultural heritage, from slavery, to the false hopes of Emancipation, a safe haven under Jim Crow, a site for mobilization and activism during the Civil Rights movement and will now serve as a local, national and international destination for many years to come for all people for the discussion of modern day race relations and for the celebration and exploration of African American history and culture.

2. Link Related Historical Sites to create the Heritage Corridor

From the Slave Ships landing in Galveston, to slaves traveling into Ft. Bend and Harris County, up the Brazos into Washington County and from East Texas into Central Texas.

3. Provides Opportunities for Access to Federal Funding for the Region

4. Serves as a Catalyst for Economic Development

5. Encourages Tourism in the Region

Emancipation Park can serve as the Welcoming Center and the Conservancy can provide the oversight for the NHC

6. Raises the Profile of the Project for the Capital Campaign

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment to the Interior and EPA Appropriations bill which, I hope, all Members can and will support.

First, I would like to commend Chairman CALVERT for his work on this legislation and for including critical provisions to prevent the EPA from moving forward on crippling new regulations on our economy.

Mr. Chairman, since 2009, our job creators have faced an onslaught of regulations from the EPA even as Congress has consistently reduced the Agency's budget year after year. The EPA has proposed a regulation to lower the national ozone standard, which is largely based on shaky scientific data and could cost our economy billions of dollars a year. The EPA has also proposed new regulations on new and existing power plants that could substantially increase energy prices for hard-working families and small businesses.

The Agency has cited its authority to regulate under the Clean Air Act as the basis for many of these decisions. However, when it comes to evaluating how its regulations impact American jobs, the Agency has failed to follow the law. Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act clearly states: ''The Administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss or shifts of employment.''

Last year, the EPA was sued because of its failure to comply with this provision. Additionally, we heard testimony last month before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee that further reinforced the EPA's failure to evaluate employment impacts as Congress has directed under section 321(a).

It is unacceptable for the EPA Administrators to cherry-pick the law based on their own ideological agenda. That is why I have introduced this amendment, which would ensure that the EPA abides by the law and conducts ongoing evaluations of just how their actions impact jobs in America. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CARRY OUT SEISMIC AIRGUN TESTING OR SURVEYS OFF COAST OF FLORIDA

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out seismic airgun testing or seismic airgun surveys in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area, the Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area, or the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area located within the exclusive economic zone (as defined in section 107 of title 46, United States Code) bordering the State of Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the Murphy, Castor, Jolly, Posey, Clawson, Graham, DeSantis, Ros-Lehtinen, Grayson, Buchanan, Hastings, Wilson amendment to block the use of seismic airgun testing off of Florida's coast.

As you can see from the list of cosponsors, offshore drilling is not a partisan issue in our State but an economic issue. Florida is a unique place that depends on healthy beaches, clean waters, and a safeguarded environment. The seismic testing that the administration has proposed puts all of these things at risk.

First, seismic airgun testing can be harmful to undersea mammals like endangered whale species and dolphins, disrupting their ability to communicate and navigate. It can also have negative effects on sea turtles, such as the loggerhead sea turtle, that have key nesting grounds along the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches in the district that I am so proud to represent. This testing practice can also disrupt fish migratory patterns that could have significant impacts on fishermen in Florida.

□ 2245

Second, seismic airgun testing is the first step in the wrong direction to opening our pristine shores to offshore drilling and to the threat of devastating oil spills. Florida has more coastline than any other continental State in the United States, and our economy depends on healthy beaches.

I was proud when former Governor Jeb Bush and Florida's congressional delegation actually came together and fought to block drilling off Florida's coast, and now I am proud to join my many Florida colleagues to block this administration from putting special interests over the economic and environmental needs of our State.

Whatever your party, Floridians protect their environmental treasures at all costs. As residents on the Gulf Coast are too well aware—and as I have seen firsthand myself—oil spills can devastate our environment and our economy up and down the coast. Twenty cities throughout Florida have passed resolutions proactively banning seismic testing because they know it is a rotten deal for our State.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this administration has already developed the most restrictive policies for the use of seismic airguns for offshore exploration to date. We do not need to place a moratorium on the use.

Further, the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area is more than 125 miles off the Florida coast, and the South Atlantic Planning Area also affects Georgia and South Carolina. So the amendment affects many other States other than his own. Also, the Department of the Interior has already classified the Straits of Florida as a low resource potential or low support for potential new listing. As such, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do appreciate the chairman's hard work on this bill, and many Members of Congress who are supporting this in a bipartisan manner. In Florida, it is pretty clear to see, based on the cosponsors of this bill, that this isn't a partisan issue.

I would like to remind the chairman that regardless of how far offshore this is, what really matters is the infrastructure onshore. You could talk about these sites, it doesn't matter how far offshore. The fact is, you are going to have to have infrastructure there onshore that really starts to impede with our economy, whether that is the beaches, whether that is the

tourism, whether that is the fishing industry. So there is a lot more to it. But I do respect the chairman's hard work on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. NOEM

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE OR MOVE FISHERIES ARCHIVES

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or move the D.C. Booth Historic National Fish Hatchery and Archives.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from South Dakota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to prevent the Fish and Wildlife Service from closing fish hatcheries across the United States. I want to thank the chairman and his staff for all their dedication and for preventing the closure of these hatcheries in the underlying bill. My amendment only clarifies their language to ensure that it prevents closure of hatcheries and archives, which operate a little bit differently within the hatchery system.

For example, the D.C. Booth Historic National Fish Hatchery and Archives has been a cornerstone of the community in Spearfish, South Dakota, with over 150,000 visitors annually. It was originally established in 1896 to introduce and maintain trout in the Black Hills of South Dakota, but it is much more than a fish hatchery. It is home to an 1800's era museum, a 1910 railroad car, priceless artifacts, and educational opportunities for children. Moving these items would cost taxpayers, which doesn't make any sense, given the tens of thousands of volunteer hours and private funds that are leveraged to run this hatchery.

I want to thank the chairman for working with me to preserve these hatcheries and archives that are certainly of cultural significance. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to prevent their closure.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. This amendment is consistent with policy agreed to last year in the conference on a bipartisan basis. Fishing is a national pastime, to which the national fish hatchery plays an important role.

Therefore, I support the gentlewoman's amendment, and I urge an ''aye'' vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUZER

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 16, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 13671 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, in early March 2015, the Environmental Protection Agency published the final rule establishing excessive new standards for wood heaters. This onerous rule is a classic example of bureaucratic overreach that has become all too common at the EPA. Manufacturers in my district, as well as consumers, are very concerned about the negative impacts of these new standards.

According to press reports, 10 percent of U.S. households still choose to burn wood to keep energy costs as low as possible. The number of households that rely on wood as their primary heating source rose by nearly one-third from the year 2005 to 2012.

This new rule is of particular concern for rural residents all across this country. Because of this new rule, the cost of manufacturing wood heaters would increase substantially, making them unaffordable for many.

It is no secret that costs from additional regulations are always passed down to the consumers. Several States, in fact, have expressed their concern on this matter. Wisconsin, Missouri, Michigan, Virginia, and my home State of North Carolina have all introduced or passed legislation that prohibits their respective environmental agencies from enforcing this burdensome, unnecessary regulation.

In defense of all the fine Americans who want to purchase wood heaters, my amendment to the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act prohibits any funds from being used to implement, administer, or enforce these new, unnecessary, and costly standards. Simply put, the Federal Government has no business telling private citizens how they should heat their homes or their businesses. After all, this is America. If an individual or family wants to heat their home or business using a wood stove or furnace, they should be able to do so without paying through the nose.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congressmen WALTER JONES, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, ROD BLUM, MARK MEADOWS, MIKE BISHOP, SEAN DUFFY, and THOMAS MASSIE for their support on this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my colleague and friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership on this issue and for yielding the time to me.

First, the administration went after coal. Now it is coming after wood heat. In March, the EPA finalized a new rule to regulate the type of wood burning stoves and boilers that you can buy, forcing millions of middle class Americans to pay more to heat their homes.

That is why I am cosponsoring this legislation, to stop the administration from enforcing new prohibitions on a renewable, abundant, and, dare I say, carbon-neutral method of heating our homes that has been with us for centuries. If it passes, our amendment to the EPA funding bill will prohibit the Federal Government from using taxpayer money to enforce crippling regulations on wood burning heating appliances.

As the price of electricity skyrockets due to the President's promise to bankrupt the coal industry, wood heat is a viable alternative for millions of Americans. Unfortunately, it seems like this administration would rather see people turn to the government for public assistance with their heating bills than to allow them an affordable means of self-sufficiency.

Mr. Chairman, this is a State issue. The Federal Government should not be regulating wood burning appliances. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I just rise in support of the amendment. I know the State of North Carolina opposed the rule and passed the legislation a few months ago to block these EPA regulations. I suspect it is not the only State that may have these concerns. Let's let the market drive manufacturers toward producing lower emission wood heaters.

I support the gentleman's amendment and urge an ''aye'' vote. I hope that everybody who supports this amendment would also vote for the bill for final passage.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

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

Mr. MASSIE. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REMOVE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 260 FROM LEASING PROGRAM

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove oil and gas lease sale 260 from the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2017-2022.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to offer an amendment that prohibits the administration from blocking the proposed Atlantic lease sale from the Department of the Interior's draft proposed plan for offshore oil and gas development.

As cochairman of the Atlantic Offshore Energy Caucus, I have been fighting to advance an all-of-the-above energy strategy that gets North Carolina into the energy business.

□ 2300

I was pleased when the administration recently heeded calls from Members of Congress—as well as our fine Governor, Pat McCrory, and other State leaders—when they announced a proposal to open up the Atlantic to offshore natural gas and oil exploration.

I welcome the proposal as one of the many steps that must be taken to unlock our natural resources, create jobs, and boost our economy.

The problem is we now face bureaucratic hoops and an uphill rulemaking process that could take the Atlantic lease sale completely off the table. In fact, Secretary Sally Jewell testified recently that she could not guarantee the Atlantic lease would stay in the plan once it is finalized.

For years, there has been bipartisan support for an offshore lease sale off the Atlantic Coast. One was even scheduled off the coast of Virginia, but later blocked by this administration.

North Carolina has incredible potential for energy jobs, and I won't let this opportunity slip through our fingers.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is critical to provide certainty to North Carolina and unleash jobs and lower energy prices. Our economy is sputtering along, and too many folks back home are struggling to find jobs. Opening up the Atlantic to oil has the potential to support more than 55,000 jobs in our State and contribute nearly $3 billion in new revenue.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. I am not going to oppose the amendment. I certainly appreciate what the gentleman is trying to accomplish and generally agree that this administration has placed way too many restrictions on drilling, both onshore and offshore.

These restrictions have delayed the permitting process and slowed economic growth in your State and many other States around the Union. Various groups have used that to their advantage.

I agree that more certainty is needed in the leasing and permitting process. What I am afraid of is this might lead to a precedent for preempting the Department of the Interior's decision-making under any President, and may lead to other amendments and kind of opening Pandora's box, and Members doing specific amendments that are off their particular States.

Saying that, as we move this process forward, I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I just have some concerns we can talk about as we move this process along.

We both want the same outcome. I just want to make sure that we make sure this works in an orderly fashion.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank the chairman for his comments, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. This amendment would mandate that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management include the South and mid-Atlantic area of the Outer Continental Shelf, otherwise known as sale 260 in the 2017–2022 lease sale schedule.

The amendment would undermine the Bureau's fundamental mission to manage the development of offshore resources in an environmentally and economically responsible manner.

The Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf is a frontier area, and the decision to include sale 260 in the 2017–2022 5-year leasing schedule should be informed by sound science, using the best available data.

The Bureau is required by law to consider the environmental impacts of leasing decisions, and this includes a comprehensive programmatic environmental impact statement, which has not yet been completed for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf.

In fact, the most current geological and geophysical data on the oil and gas resources in this area was collected in the 1970s and 1980s. That is really ancient by today's scientific standards.

Without the collection and analysis of new information, input from State Governors and other Federal agencies, and consideration of critical economic analyses, the decision to include sale 260 in the 2017–2022 program is premature and runs counter to the thoughtful and deliberative process established by Congress through the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

This amendment would violate multiple environmental statutes, including NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act.

The amendment undermines environmental protection required by law. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's comments on the subject.

The reason we need this step is to guarantee that the folks in North Carolina get a shot at these jobs. We are talking about 55,000 jobs and potentially as much as $3 billion in economic development in our State.

Frankly, it has been frustrating how hard it has been to get this process moved forward. If you look at the proposed lease sale, the sale is allowed in the fourth year of the 5-year period. Only one sale is even allowed. An artificial buffer of 50 miles was inserted into the sale.

We are getting one sale late in the 5-year period, with a 50-mile buffer, when the old seismic shows that most of that oil and gas is around 25 miles out.

The ''yes'' that we got from the administration and the fact this process is even moving forward is good news for North Carolina and the other States on the Atlantic Coast; but it is certainly not, in my opinion, an appropriate response to the potential we have got there.

I agree with the gentlewoman when she said the seismic is old; the seismic was done in the late seventies, but this administration has called for new seismic mapping. I am looking forward to that because, again, we want to use good science.

We have given one opportunity pretty far out in the fourth year of a 5-year period, and I am afraid we are going to lose that because, if you look at the history under this administration, there was a lease sale proposed in Virginia and that was taken away.

I think, to guarantee that we get at least some shot at unlocking this potential off the coast of getting the American sources of energy into the pipeline, getting North Carolinians to work in these energy jobs, I think it is important we have this amendment. I would urge my colleagues to support this.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina and his concerns about jobs for his home State, but as a Member of

Congress who also represents the coastal State of Maine, I know the deep concerns that people have about the potential dangers of offshore oil drilling and the possible dangers to the fisheries, marine mammals, and a whole variety of other things. The reason we have this process is it is critically important to our State.

Mr, Chairman, I continue to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to issue, implement, administer, or enforce any regulation of particulate matter emissions from residential barbecues.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to offer an amendment that would prohibit the EPA from regulating particulate matter emissions from residential barbecues.

As you may recall, last August, the EPA issued a grant to ''perform research and develop preventative technology that will reduce fine particulate emissions from residential barbecues.''

The EPA gets a lot of things wrong, especially with this preposterous study. For one thing, ''barbecue'' is a term us southerners use to talk about the best pork in North Carolina or a community pig picking.

What they are proposing is reducing emissions from residential propane grills, which means they want to stop you and me from grilling outside on our own property. By the way, propane is one of the most clean and efficient sources of energy out there.

Regulations that waste our time, money, and resources are bad as it is, but they are trying to go as far as restricting our personal freedom.

Mr. Chairman, this grant was met with staunch opposition from conservatives and other outdoor enthusiasts like myself. If this isn't part of EPA's larger goal of regulating grill emissions, then it begs the question why they are wasting our hard-earned tax dollars on this mind-boggling study in the first place.

We have seen overreaches by the EPA time and time again, from their flawed waters of the USA regulation to their disastrous clean power plan that is cap-and-trade by fiat to their new ground level ozone regulations that would have a catastrophic impact on manufacturing in this country; but now, they are studying limiting emissions from residential grills. Enough is enough.

Mr. Chairman, it is summer, and it is grilling season. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concerns of the Member from North Carolina, and I will give him credit. They have better barbecue than my home State. We have got you beat on lobsters, but that is how it goes.

I want to say I think this argument is somewhat cynical and a little too suspicious of our government; perhaps Republicans have gotten too far down this road.

My understanding is this summer, a conservative media outlet ran a sensationalized story about EPA's regulatory overreach. The story claimed that EPA has its eyes on pollution from backyard barbecues. The problem with the story and this amendment is that it is based on a false premise and a mischaracterization of important work.

EPA operates a successful and innovative grant program that encourages students around the Nation to design solutions for a sustainable future. It is called People, Prosperity, and the Planet Student Design Competition for Sustainability. Its purpose is to foster innovation, not to create regulations.

The EPA awarded one of these design grants to a group of University of California students working to design a system to make barbecues burn cleaner and be better for the environment. The students received $15,000 from the EPA for the idea. In addition, the university has said the idea has potential for global application.

Mr. Chair, in many developing nations, women hunch over traditional cook stoves for hours a day, breathing in toxic smoke. Exposure to this household air pollution is responsible for low birth weights, childhood pneumonia, and more than 4 million premature deaths each year.

The availability of cleaner cooking technologies could literally be lifesaving for many of these women and children. Instead of attacking the EPA for these innovative grants, we should be applauding them.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind comments about North Carolina barbecue. I do admit the lobster rolls in Maine are pretty good. Maybe we can work out some kind of exchange.

The gentlewoman is right. I am guilty as charged. I am cynical and suspicious of the Federal Government, particularly the EPA, when you look at the some of the things they are spending our tax dollars on and some of the rules they are proposing.

Let's get serious. We are talking about a $15 million grant to study the emissions of a propane grill in your backyard.

Now, we all are concerned about toxic smoke in homes and living conditions of individuals—the example that was mentioned—but we are talking about a propane gas grill in your backyard. The EPA has no business regulating that. They have spent $15 million of our tax money to form a study, which is the first step in a rulemaking process.

I think this Chamber needs to say loud and clear to the EPA: focus on the job that the gentlewoman described, focus on the real issues and the mission of the EPA, and keep your hands off our grills in our backyards.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am happy to have an exchange—North Carolina barbecue, Maine lobster. It is probably a pretty fair exchange.

I just want to clarify. It is $15,000, not $15 million that the EPA spent working on this innovation.

I understand your concerns, and I appreciate the points that you brought up.

Mr. Chairman, I continue to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FITZPATRICK

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM

SEC. ____. For ''Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—State and Private Forestry'' for the Forest Legacy program, as authorized by section 1217 of Title XII of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 2103c), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided for ''Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources'' is reduced by, $5,985,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 2315

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer and then withdraw this amendment which will make it easier for land preservation efforts, including under the Federal Forest Legacy Program.

During my time as a local official in Pennsylvania as a Bucks County commissioner, I was proud to lead local efforts to preserve the beauty of the countryside and the Bucks County landscape, while advancing smarter development initiatives to reclaim brownfields through commonsense conservation efforts.

Along with a task force for that purpose, our community was able to expend approximately $100 million for the preservation of farmland, parkland, and critical natural areas, close to about 15,000 acres in our one county preserved.

Now, as a strong advocate for land preservation in Congress, I continue to be a supporter of vital conservation programs, including the United States Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program.

My amendment today would reallocate $5.9 million from the Bureau of Land Management, Management of Lands and Resources, to the Forest Legacy Program for the purpose of fully funding two additional preservation projects.

The Forest Legacy Program is a Federal program that supports and encourages State and private efforts to protect environmentally sensitive forestlands. The program helps the States develop and carry out their forest conservation plans, while encouraging and supporting acquisition of conservation easements without removing the property from private ownership.

Most conservation easements restrict development, require sustainable forestry practices, and protect other values.

The additional funding my amendment provides will allow for the protection of 4,000 acres of Pennsylvania forests in the Northeast Connection.

Mr. Chairman, the Northeast Connection is a collaboration between the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and three groups of over 150 families to conserve more than 4,000 contiguous forest acres which serve as a natural bridge between the 84,000-acre Delaware State Forest, which is managed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the 77,000-acre Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, managed by the National Park Service.

I believe this project is a crucial objective to preserving Pennsylvania's and our Nation's natural resources and beauty.

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his hard work on the underlying bill. I look forward to working with the chairman on robust funding for this program.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding me time, and I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work with us.

We support the Forest Legacy Program, and I pledge to you we will continue to work with you and other supporters of the program as we move this process along.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the chairman for his desire to provide additional resources, if possible, to the Forest Legacy Program. It is a great program for our Nation, well utilized by States and local communities and private landowners. I look forward to working with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT AS ENDANGERED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or any other agency of the Department of the Interior to treat the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has released a final 4(d) rule listing the northern long-eared bat as ''threatened'' under the Endangered Species Act.

While certain colonies of the species of bat have seen dramatic population losses in recent years, Fish and Wildlife has repeatedly asserted that the underlying fundamental cause is a fungal disease known as the white-nose syndrome.

White-nose syndrome does not directly kill or harm these bats. Rather, it wakes them out of hibernation, resulting in the bats burning through stored fat and leaving their hibernacula in search of food when none is often found or available.

I am pleased that the underlying legislation contains funding for white-nose syndrome research. Bats play a critical role in the ecosystem, and more needs to be done in order to restore colonies devastated by white-nose.

However, as we allow for necessary habitat conservation, we must also ensure that activities occurring in the bats' range are not unreasonably or unnecessarily impacted as a result of the Endangered Species Act listing.

Specifically, such a listing could have great impacts on forest management, forest products, agriculture, energy production, mining, and commercial development. Because this species of bat is found in 38 States and Washington, D.C., a listing under the Endangered Species Act would have significant impacts through this enormous geographical range.

My amendment is simple. It merely prohibits the Department of the Interior, for a period of 1 year, from considering any new rules beyond the final 4(d) rule or any action to treat the northern long-eared bat as endangered, which is the most restrictive form of ESA listing.

The intention is to ensure reasonable land use within the bats' range while Fish and Wildlife continues to research and work with the States on finding treatments for white-nose syndrome.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from treating the northern long-eared bat as endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

Fish and Wildlife Service listed the northern long-eared bat as threatened—threatened—with an interim rule in April of this year. Since the bat was listed as threatened and not endangered, this amendment would have no effect on the Service's implementation of the rule.

Even though the amendment has no practical effect, I strongly oppose its intent, which runs counter to the fundamental principle that science should govern our determinations under our environmental laws.

Bats are critically important to the ecosystem, and a study published in Science magazine found the value of pest control services provided by insect-eating bats in the United States ranges from the low of $3.7 billion to the high of $53 billion a year.

Additionally, researchers warn that notable economic losses to North American agriculture could occur in the next 4 to 5 years as a result of emerging threats to bat populations. Bats play an important role in our economy when it comes to eliminating pests.

The primary factor threatening the northern long-eared bat is a functional

disease called white-nose syndrome, as has been mentioned. However, because this disease has reduced populations of the bat, human activities that might not have been significant in the past are now having a greater effect.

It is appropriate that Fish and Wildlife Service is taking steps to protect the species, but we should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts. We should be supporting them, not blocking the agency from doing its job.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her perspectives. Certainly, a number of those points I agree with—the value of the bats—as chairman of the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee. In agriculture, bats serve a very important purpose.

I also agree with her premise, although I think her interpretation of what the science is is somewhat misguided. The science is extremely important, and the science has shown, in fact, the agency responsible for oversight on the Endangered Species Act has publicly acknowledged, that any job-crushing restrictions on industries related to habitat under an endangered listing with these bats will not help the northern long-eared bats. The threat really is going to an endangered listing which would do that.

I would agree that the Fish and Wildlife Service needs resources and, quite frankly, they are getting those. Just last week they released $1 million toward studying the white-nose syndrome. Within this underlying bill, I believe there is an amount of $10 million to study the white-nose syndrome. It is a fungus. It is not habitat, and it is not the industries that work within those habitats.

And so, quite frankly, we need to give the Fish and Wildlife Service what they need, and that is the support that they have already, that they released last week through many grants throughout many States, and the underlying $10 million in this underlying bill.

I would just ask for support of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I read from the amendment:

> None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by Fish and Wildlife or any other service or agency in the Department of the Interior to treat the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species.

Well, first off, I reiterate again, it is listed as threatened, not as endangered. And this amendment doesn't even address the role the Forest Service would still have. So this is a poorly constructed amendment.

We need to be very, very careful and very thoughtful when we write these amendments and make sure that we not only give Fish and Wildlife the tools that they need, that when something is threatened and not endangered, whether it is the Forest Service, Interior, or whether it is U.S. Fish and Wildlife, we need to let them do their job based on the science.

Mr. Chairman, I do not support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:
>
> SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a tiny rodent with a body approximately 3 inches long, with a 4- to 6-inch tail and large hind feet adapted for jumping. This largely nocturnal mouse lives primarily in streamside ecosystems along the foothills of southeastern Wyoming south to Colorado Springs in my district, along the front range of Colorado. To evade predators, the mouse can jump like a miniature kangaroo, up to 18 inches high, using its 6-inch-long whiplike tail as a rudder to switch directions in midair.

But the little acrobat's most famous feat was its leap onto the Endangered Species list in May 1998, a move that has hindered development in moist meadows and streamside areas from Colorado Springs, Colorado, to Laramie, Wyoming.

Among many projects that have been affected: the Jeffco Parkway southeast of Rocky Flats, an expansion of Chatfield Reservoir, and housing developments in El Paso County along tributaries of Monument Creek. Builders, landowners, and local governments in affected areas have incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in added costs because of the mouse. Protecting the mouse has even been placed ahead of protecting human life, and let me explain why that is the case.

On September 11, 2013, Colorado experienced a major flood event which damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, important infrastructure, and public works projects. And while Colorado has come a long way in rebuilding, there remains a lot of work to be done.

As a result of the Preble's mouse's listing as an endangered species, many restoration projects were delayed as Colorado sought a waiver. In fact, FEMA was so concerned that they sent out a notice that stated, ''legally required review may cause some delay in projects undertaken in the Preble's mouse habitat.''

□ 2330

It goes on to warn that ''local officials who proceed with projects without adhering to environmental laws risk fines and could lose Federal funding for their projects.'' While a waiver was eventually granted, the fact remains that the scientific evidence does not justify these delays or the millions of taxpayer dollars that go toward protecting a rodent that is actually part of a larger group that roams throughout half of the North American continent.

Several recent scientific studies have concluded that the Preble's mouse does not warrant protection because it isn't a subspecies at all and is actually part of the Bear Lodge jumping mouse population. Even the scientist that originally classified this mouse as a subspecies has since recanted his work.

Moreover, the Preble's mouse has a low conservation priority score, meaning the hundreds of millions of dollars already spent on protection efforts could have been better spent on other, more fragile species or other uses to accomplish good.

The threats that development and transportation allegedly pose to the mouse have been greatly overstated. Ample regulations already in place minimize the impact of development on this species.

My amendment would correct the injustice that has been caused by an inaccurate listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse and refocus the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts on species that have been thoroughly scientifically vetted and that actually should come under the Endangered Species Act.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit Fish and Wildlife Service from treating the Preble's meadow jumping mouse as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act and would restrict, again, the Fish and Wildlife Service from offering any of the critical protections to preserve the species.

This amendment is in addition to a growing list of anti-Endangered Species Act provisions, and it makes one wonder if—for the number of people here who are opposing the work that Fish and Wildlife is doing under the Endangered Species Act—if the intent isn't just to do away with the entire act.

Last year, Fish and Wildlife reviewed two petitions to delist the Preble's meadow jumping mouse and determined that protections under the Endangered Species were still necessary.

Voting for this amendment might undo a lot of work that was done that is well on its way to having this mouse removed from the endangered species list because this amendment ignores the determination and short-circuits the statutory process informed by science.

I would certainly think that a rider on this bill is not the place to have a robust debate about how close we are maybe with Fish and Wildlife being able to delist this mouse and, by putting this language in the bill, that it undoes a lot of potentially good work.

It throws out, with this amendment, the carefully science-based work, as I said, that the Fish and Wildlife Service has worked towards and chips away at the very foundation of the Endangered Species Act, which makes me wonder, as I said earlier, if the intent of many of the amendments being offered is not only to chip away but to do away with the Endangered Species Act.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, all I will say in response is that this is a subspecies—actually, it is not even a species or subspecies. It should have never been listed in the first place.

The science shows that it is actually part of the Bear Lodge jumping mouse population. For that reason, it shouldn't even be on the list in the first place.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman's remarks, this is not the place—as a rider on the environmental appropriations bill—to be having these thoughtful discussions. If that is what needs to take place, this is not the bill to be doing it on. I mean, we have an authorizing committee. They can hear things on it; and you can have a robust, full, transparent discussion and bring all the scientists in.

Let me close with this: I would be really remiss if I did not remind my colleagues that the Endangered Species Act, in fact, did rescue the bald eagle. The bald eagle's recovery is an American success story because we were united in the belief that this was the symbol of our Nation and was worth protecting for the continuing benefit of future generations.

It feels like we have lost sight of being able to do that today, especially with the lack of transparency and full debate that takes place with all these riders being offered on an authorization bill.

Congress needs to give serious consideration of what kind of conservation legacy we are leaving for our children, and our children will want us to do a better job than just to put riders onto an appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have one other amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a review as required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(2) et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply ensures that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has to follow section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act by conducting a review of all threatened and endangered plants and wildlife at least once every 5 years. It prohibits any funds in the bill from being used to implement or enforce the listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone the review as required by law.

Under the Endangered Species Act, the purpose of a 5-year review is to ensure that threatened and endangered species have the appropriate level of protection. The reviews assess each threatened and endangered species to determine whether its status has changed since the time of its listing or its last status review and whether it should be removed from the list, delisted; reclassified from endangered to threatened, downlisted; reclassified from threatened to endangered, uplisted; or maintain its current classification. You can find all this on the Web site of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Because the Endangered Species Act grants extensive protection to a species, including harsh penalties for landowners and other citizens, it makes sense to verify if a plant or animal should be on the list in the first place.

Despite this commonsense requirement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has acknowledged that it has neglected its responsibility to conduct the required reviews for hundreds of listed species.

For example, in Florida alone, it was found that 77 species out of a total of 124 protected species in that State were overdue for a 5-year review. In other words, the government had not followed the law for a staggering 62 percent of species in that State.

In California, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledged that it had failed to follow the law for roughly two-thirds of the State's species listed under the Endangered Species Act and was forced by the courts to conduct the required reviews of 194 species.

By enforcing the 5-year review, which is in current law, my amendment will ensure that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is using the best available scientific information in implementing its responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, including incorporating new information through public comment and assessing ongoing conservation efforts. These are things we should all be in agreement with.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in ensuring that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service follows the Endangered Species Act, that we do not provide money in this bill that would violate current law.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, again, would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the Endangered Species Act listing for any species that has not undergone a review. This amendment joins a growing list of anti-Endangered Species Act provisions.

The amendment would block the listing of any species that does not receive status review by Fish and Wildlife Service every 5 years. Fish and Wildlife Service is required to do a 5-year review every 5 years after a species is listed. However, with over 1,500 domestic listed species, that would amount to over 300 status reviews every year.

Why hasn't Fish and Wildlife done it? Well, it is because we—Congress—do not provide Fish and Wildlife Service with enough resources to complete such a large task.

Follow the law? They would love to. In fact, this bill that we are considering right now includes a 50 percent—a 50 percent—cut in the listing program. Now, how can they follow the law when Congress doesn't put any tools in the toolbox allowing them to do their job?

I really have to wonder if this House is prepared to appropriate the millions of dollars that would be needed to meet the requirement of this amendment.

Fish and Wildlife Service already follows a transparent, science-based listing process. This amendment only seeks to undermine the Endangered Species Act because there is not enough money in here that Congress provides Fish and Wildlife to do the job in the fashion that Congress has asked it to do.

In order to list a species under the Endangered Species Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service follows a strict legal process known as a rulemaking procedure. The first step in assessing the

status of the species is the Fish and Wildlife Service publishes a notice of reviews that identify the species that is believed to meet the definition of threatened or endangered. The species are candidates.

Now, these notices of review then, the Fish and Wildlife Service goes out and seeks biological information to complete the status of the reviews for the candidate species; then the Fish and Wildlife Service publishes those notices in the Federal Register so the process is transparent to the public.

As you can see, the Fish and Wildlife Service follows an open, transparent policy that adequately reviews the species prior to listing. This amendment would exploit a 5-year review backlog that has been caused in part by this Congress' unwillingness to provide adequate funding in order to attack the endangered species list. Let's be transparent about that.

The Endangered Species Act exists to offer necessary protections to ensure species survival. Quite frankly, the majority of our constituents support that. Let's make sure that science and species management practices continue to dictate species listings, not Congress; and let's figure out a way to come together, as the gentleman said, to give Fish and Wildlife the tools that they need in order that they can follow the laws that Congress has requested them to follow and not do a smoke and mirror show about how Fish and Wildlife is refusing to follow the law.

They can only do what they are able to do with the dollars that Congress appropriates to them.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my colleague from Minnesota acknowledged that it is required under the law for Fish and Wildlife Service to do these 5-year reviews. I thank her for admitting that.

Their budget is approximately $1.4 billion, and they are able to prioritize within that $1.4 billion where they spend their resources. It is not Congress' fault. They just haven't made it a priority. They should make it a priority to follow the law. They can do these few hundred reviews every year out of $1.4 billion, I am sure.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. Let's require this agency to follow the laws that are on the books.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to be really clear. This bill now includes a 50 percent cut to the listing program. The listing program is money that Congress puts in it to do the reviews. Congress cut it by 50 percent.

They can't just transfer money around. We have handcuffed and tied up the Fish and Wildlife Service by the amount of funding that Congress gives them to do their job.

They don't wake up in the morning and say: We don't want to follow the law.

They wake up in the morning, and they see how much Congress has appropriated them.

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. McCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. I just want to point out that what you are talking about would be in the future. I am talking about the current status of them not following the law by doing the reviews.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, they do not have the funding.

□ 2345

Congress has not given them the funding in the listing program to do their job. Congress needs to be held accountable for the 300 listings not being able to be done every year because Congress has failed to give them the money to do the laws that Congress passed.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the actions described as a ''backstop'' in the December 29, 2009, letter from EPA's Regional Administrator to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State's watershed implementation and referred to in enclosure B of such letter.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply prohibits the EPA from using the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load and the Watershed Implementation Plans to take over States' water quality strategies, protecting the 10th Amendment rights of States across the Nation from the heavy hand of the EPA. This amendment makes it clear that Congress intended for the Clean Water Act to be State led, not subject to the whims of politicians and bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

Over the last several years, the EPA has implemented a total maximum daily load plan for the Chesapeake Bay watershed which strictly limits the amount of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay. While a laudable goal and one I support in principle, through its implementation, the EPA has basically given every State in the watershed an ultimatum—either the State does exactly what the EPA says, or it faces the threat of an EPA takeover of their water quality programs. In some cases, the EPA will even rewrite the States' water quality plans if they disagree with the States' decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that this amendment would not stop the EPA from working with the States to restore the Chesapeake Bay, nor would it in any way undermine the cleanup efforts already underway. I repeat, our amendment does not stop the TMDL or watershed implementation plans from moving forward, and it does not prevent the EPA from working cooperatively with the States to help restore the Chesapeake Bay.

This amendment is very carefully crafted to address the 10th Amendment federalism issues that the EPA is encroaching upon and does not address the States' laudable goals of continuing to improve the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

The States should be able to use any resources the EPA may have available to help develop and implement a strategy to restore the Bay. This amendment only stops the ability of the EPA to step in and take over a State's plan—again, ensuring states' rights remain intact and not usurped by the EPA.

Mr. Chairman, the Bay is a national treasure, and I want to see it restored. But we know that in order to achieve this goal, the States and the EPA must work together. The EPA cannot be allowed to railroad the States and micromanage the process.

With this amendment, we are simply telling the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act and help prevent another Federal power grab by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the amendment, and I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, here we go again, yet another fix in search of a problem.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment. It would deliberately undermine the crucial work that is already being done to rehabilitate the Chesapeake Bay. It would also undermine the historic Federal-State partnership that has done so much already to improve the quality of the Bay and its surroundings.

Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. It is the Nation's

largest estuary. It benefits all Americans, and especially those living in the six States that comprise the Bay watershed: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, and the District of Columbia.

The States in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, including the gentleman's own home State of Virginia, have been working together for over 40 years to clean up the Bay. And guess what, Mr. Chairman? It is working.

The Chesapeake Bay Program's most recent interim report shows that tremendous progress has been made. States are meeting the pollution reduction goals in their plans. In fact, some are exceeding them. Studies show that so-called ''dead zones'' are shrinking, and key populations such as oysters are starting to rebound.

Under the Chesapeake Clean Water Blueprint, States develop and implement their own pollution reduction plans. The EPA set up an initial framework, but the details of how each State chooses to reach the targets, in fact, are State-driven and State-implemented. My own home State of Maryland has created a plan to reduce its nitrogen levels by 46 percent, phosphorus by 48 percent, and sediment by 28 percent below the benchmark 1985 levels.

Of course, each of the Bay watershed States depends on the other States to implement these plans simultaneously and in good faith. After all, Mr. Chairman, watersheds don't stop at the State borders, and the kind of go-it-alone approach that seems to be advocated by the majority has never worked for environmental issues, and it will not work to preserve and to save the Chesapeake Bay.

Failure, for example, by one State to do its part threatens the work and hundreds of millions of dollars that all the other States have invested in their plans. I don't want to see Maryland's work jeopardized because another State in the watershed doesn't meet its responsibilities. And only the EPA can stand as the arbiter to make sure that that is true.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a safety measure against that kind of bad faith by one of the partners, the EPA has backstop actions that it can take to ensure that the other States' investments are preserved. These backstop actions are not new authorities, but they are existing authorities that the EPA can use to make the needed pollution reductions. That has been part of the partnership for 40 years.

In fact, just yesterday, the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia unanimously affirmed the EPA's authority to place restrictions on wastewater treatment and runoff by farms and construction. The EPA places limits on the amount of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment that are allowed in the watershed and, thus, into the Bay. This is known as the total maximum daily load, or TMDL, of chemical runoff that the Bay's watershed can handle while still meeting water quality standards.

The court in its decision strongly affirmed that ''the States and EPA could, working together, best allocate the benefits and burdens of lowering pollution.'' It is, in fact, an acknowledgment that this is a partnership that requires the full participation of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Chairman, the goal of the partnership is not just an environmental one. According to a peer-reviewed report by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, the economic impact of full implementation of the Clean Water Blueprint is more than $22 billion annually. Yet this amendment by one of Virginia's own Members actually threatens that partnership by barring the EPA from using funds to take any backstop actions. It would allow one State to break its agreement and cease implementing the plan.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Maryland's time has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the pertinent subcommittee in the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment.

Since 2009, I have been hearing directly from my constituents—many of who are small farmers—about the significant challenges and costs of the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load mandate. These significant concerns also extend to the State and local governments because of the billions of dollars in direct costs and new regulatory burdens that TMDL imposes. No doubt the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure, but it is quickly becoming the national treasury with all these costs and taxes upon our States and local municipalities.

The Agriculture Committee's Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which I have the honor of chairing, has also heard directly from the stakeholders over the past few Congresses.

While each and every one of these witnesses wholeheartedly supports the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, there remains great concern over the lack of consistent models, the heavy-handed approach of TMDL, and the lack of needed flexibility while implementing the WIPs. This amendment is needed in order to allow for that flexibility at the State and local levels.

Pennsylvania has been very innovative in our efforts to do our part with the Bay restoration, and that innovation will continue into the future.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

However, rather than acting punitively, EPA must work collaboratively with the States.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is quite right. This is very costly for the States. The State of Virginia has estimated a cost of over $16 billion to comply with the backstop requirements of the EPA. That is just one of the six States.

Secondly, the EPA has been asked repeatedly, including in hearings conducted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his subcommittee and at my request and the request of others, to do a cost-benefit analysis to show us that the multi-tens of billions of dollars that these six States will collectively spend will be reflected in improvements to the quality of the Chesapeake Bay. They have never provided that cost-benefit analysis.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from Maryland, she also is quite right that tremendous progress has been made in improving the health of the Chesapeake Bay, but almost all of it prior to the President taking his pen and signing the executive order that contains this backstop language that we need to stop and return the power to the State and local governments.

Sedimentation, phosphorus, and nitrogen are all down more than 40 percent—sedimentation more than 50 percent going into the Bay. The Bay is improving in its health because of the work done by the States. They should have the authority to do this without having the EPA hold a gun to their head.

Mr. Chairman, that is why this amendment should be passed, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I thank Ms. MCCOLLUM for her work on this bill and to BOBBY SCOTT and DON BEYER for joining me in this effort. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Just yesterday, the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals upheld EPA authority to set Chesapeake Bay pollution limits, which have led to the best cleanup progress in over 25 years. For the Bay, as with so many other waters across the country, the Clean Water Act backstop is critical to ensure that states are meeting their commitments.

In Maryland, we have cities working to manage stormwater and farmers implementing best management practices to stop runoff. But for all our efforts, we will never have a clean and healthy Bay if pollution runs downstream from Pennsylvania, New York, or West Virginia.

With our enormous watershed, encompassing 64,000 square miles, six States, and

D.C., everyone must do their fair share. And to do that is through the Clean Water Act's Federal backstop. I strongly oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce section 1037.601(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under the proposed rule entitled ''Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles - Phase 2'' signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on June 19, 2015 (Docket No. EPA–HQ–OAR–2014-0827), or any rule of the same substance, with respect to glider kits and glider vehicles (as defined in section 1037.801 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under such proposed rule).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

□ 0000

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect Tennessee workers and small manufacturing businesses from the EPA's latest overreach.

Last month, the EPA released its Phase 2 fuel-efficiency and emissions standards for new medium-and heavy-duty trucks.

While many in the trucking industry are not opposed to this rule as a whole, one section in the proposal wrongly applies these new standards to what is known as glider kits.

I recently toured a business in my district that manufactures these kits. For those who don't know, a glider kit is a group of truck parts that can include a brand-new frame, cab, or axles, but does not include an engine or transmission.

Since a glider kit is less expensive than buying a new truck and can extend the working life of a truck, businesses and drivers with damaged or older vehicles may choose to purchase one of these kits instead of buying a completely new vehicle.

Unfortunately, the EPA is proposing to apply the new Phase 2 standards to glider kits, even though the gliders are not really new vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, this directly impacts my district where we have glider kits being manufactured and purchased by companies in places like Byrdstown, Sparta, and Jamestown, communities that are already struggling with an above average unemployment and would see job opportunities put further out of reach if this misguided rule goes into effect.

It is also unclear whether the EPA even has the authority to regulate replacement parts like gliders in the first place.

Once more, while the EPA's stated goal with Phase 2 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the Agency has not studied the emissions impact of remanufactured engines and gliders compared to new vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, if the EPA is going to promulgate rules that raise costs and hurt jobs in districts like mine, the least they could do is to have a few facts prepared to back them up.

Under this ill-advised rule, businesses and drivers that wish to use glider kits would be effectively forced to buy a completely new vehicle instead. Reducing glider sales would also end up limiting consumer choice in the marketplace.

That is why my amendment protects businesses, jobs, and consumers by prohibiting the EPA from moving forward with this Phase 2 standard on glider kits.

To be clear, this amendment would not—would not—bar the EPA from implementing the whole Phase 2 rule for new medium- and heavy-duty trucks. It would simply clarify that glider kits and glider vehicles are not new trucks as the EPA wrongly claims.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to help support American manufacturing and stop the EPA from attempting to shut down the glider industry.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

It is my understanding that the proposed rule is supported broadly by many in the trucking manufacturing industry, so for that reason, I support her amendment.

However, as with any rule, there are some specifics that we need to iron out. I would like to work with my colleague and with EPA to see if we can't resolve those specifics between now and the final rule.

In the meantime, I support including language in the Interior bill, and I urge Members to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the discussion that the subcommittee chair and the author of the amendment might prove something better than what this amendment is currently in front of us, but what I have to work on is what is currently in front of me.

Just over 2 weeks ago, the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Highway Safety Traffic Administration issued proposed fuel efficiency standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks required by the Energy Independence and Security Act.

This amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing, implementing, and administering or enforcing this proposed rule or any future rules—so this is where I am concerned about the way this amendment is moving forward—with respect to glider vehicles.

These new standards were designed to improve fuel efficiency, cut carbon pollution, and reduce the impacts of climate change. To be specific, these standards are expected to lower CO_2 emissions by roughly 1 billion metric tons, cut fuel costs by $170 million, and reduce oil consumption up to 1.8 billion barrels over the lifetime if a vehicle is sold under this program.

Heavy trucks account for 5 percent of the vehicles on the road; yet they create 20 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions created by all transportation sectors.

We know from my colleagues that this amendment does not actually suspend all aspects of the new rule. As it was pointed out, it simply carves out an exemption for one particular industry, an industry that produces what has been called, today, glider vehicles.

As has been pointed out, glider vehicles are heavy-duty vehicles that replace older remanufactured engines on new truck chassis. These engines date back to 2001 or older, and they have emissions that are 20 to 40 times higher than today's clean diesel engines.

In essence, this amendment would allow an entire segment of the truck manufacturing industry to simply avoid compliance with the new criteria pollutant standards that are in the rule. These are engines that will continue to emit greenhouse gases, slow down our progress, and reduce the impacts of climate change.

In short, this amendment creates a loophole that you could drive a truck through by allowing dirty engines to continue to pollute our environment.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to once again reiterate that this is a very narrow amendment. It does not apply to new trucks, as the EPA rule indicates.

I also want to reiterate one more time that they have not studied the emissions impact of these remanufactured engines and the gliders compared to new vehicles, so we would like to have that information as well.

I also want to add that the military also uses glider kits, and this rule would not apply to them. Once again, we are putting into place something where we say this is what the government can do, but this is what the private sector can do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Alternative A, Alternative C, or Alternative D, described in the Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in St. Augustine, Florida, for the educational center authorized by Public Law 108–480 nor shall funds be expended for a new General Management Plan other than the General Management Plan approved by record of decision published in the Federal Register September 10, 2007.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, every year, nearly 1.5 million visitors come to the Castillo de San Marcos and Fort Matanzas National Monuments in America's oldest city, St. Augustine, Florida.

Way back some 11 years ago, in December of 2004, I passed legislation authorizing a visitors center for Castillo de San Marcos, which was signed into law. The Castillo fortress is the largest intact Spanish fortress in the continental United States, with construction that was completed in 1695.

After the authorization was signed into law, significant, thorough, costly, and time-consuming studies and reports were completed after many reviews, hearings, and public forums.

Then in 2007, 3 years later, the National Park Service came up with a final general management plan. This plan developed four alternatives. One was to do nothing; that was A. Two others, C and D, were to possibly build on land that will no longer be available that was going to be made available by the State and the city. That leaves one alternative. Now, this is a very simple, clarifying amendment.

Alternative B is the one that we would like funds spent on. Here, we are saying no funds shall be spent to do nothing; no funds will be spent or wasted to go towards a project that isn't going to happen.

This is a simple, clarifying, limiting amendment. It would specifically limit funds from being expended on any alternative, except for B, which is in the plan, been in the plan. It doesn't say that we have to do another plan; why spend more taxpayer moneys to do another plan? That is all it says.

It is a simple thing to get us moving to proceed with the final design without further cost and further delaying the process. A visitors center at Castillo is long overdue, and it is overdue on St. Augustine's 450th founding anniversary, so I urge its passage.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman from Florida raising this issue. I always learn new facts when we have these debates. I didn't know that St. Augustine was the Nation's oldest city. I always thought it was Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mr. MICA. Some people are under the misconception of Williamsburg.

Mr. CALVERT. I know; but I have learned something today.

I certainly commend the gentleman's longstanding interest in this. I know you have been working on this for a number of years. The Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in St. Augustine needs a new visitors center.

I certainly look forward to working with you as we move this issue forward, and we certainly have no objection to this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for his indulgence at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue that has been under investigation by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Energy and Commerce Committee for over the last 6 years.

In 2006, without consultation from the Energy and Commerce Committee, there was included a provision in the annual Interior, EPA appropriations bill that allowed the Environmental Protection Agency to begin using a special pay program that was explicitly and exclusively authorized for use by the Public Health Service administration under the Department of Health and Human Services.

This special pay mechanism allows a government employee to leave the normal GS pay scale and receive nearly uncapped compensation, upwards of $200,000 to $300,000 per year.

This special provision was intended to be used only in unique circumstances where, perhaps, leaders of the healthcare industry would not be able to work for the Federal Government because of pay considerations if they did not have access to these higher salaries.

This justification cannot be used for anyone at the Environmental Protection Agency. Indeed, some of the employees that the Environmental Protection Agency pays under title 42, the part of the U.S. Code that allows for this special pay, were previous government workers and were merely moved to this special pay scale because they wanted additional money.

□ 0015

The EPA claims that, because the Environmental Protection Agency is a health organization, it may use this statute to pay special hires, and this, in fact, has endured for several years. Originally, the Environmental Protection Agency was granted only a handful of slots to fill with title 42 hires. That number is now over 50. The cost to taxpayers for these 50 employees is in the tens of millions of dollars.

This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from hiring any new employees under title 42 or from transferring current employees from the GS pay scale to title 42. It would not affect current employees being paid by this provision. It would give the Energy and Commerce Committee, the authorizing committee, the time it needs to address whether the Environmental Protection Agency truly deserves this special pay consideration. The General Accountability Office looked into the abuse of title 42 several years ago and found numerous problems with the implementation of the program. Why we would allow this problematic pay structure to be advanced by the EPA is, in fact, mysterious.

In multiple hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee, both Administrator Lisa Jackson and current Administrator Gina McCarthy refused to give specifics regarding this program. A Freedom of Information Act request sent to my office by the EPA union, the American Federation of Government Employees, showed that title 42 hires at the EPA are actually sowing the seeds of discontent amongst workers, with the union asking the Congress to stop this unfair hiring technique.

Both former Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman BARTON and I have introduced legislation further clarifying that the Public Health Services Act, written for the Department of Health and Human Services, does not permit the Environmental Protection Agency to use its language to hire employees under a special pay structure. This amendment prevents further abuses of the program, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the EPA is one of several government agencies that uses a special authority to hire Federal employees with specific scientific research credentials. In fact, when the Republicans were the majority party in 2006, they started this program. The EPA didn't start this program on its own. Congress started it in 2006 under a Republican majority. The National Institutes of Health uses title 42 money and authority to attract top-tier scientists in their fields to do important research.

We have been listening to many hours this evening of many of my Republican colleagues criticizing the EPA's scientific conclusions. So now it amazes me that the gentleman wants to reduce the Agency's ability to hire the top scientists. Further, the National Academy of Sciences has favorably reported to the committee that the EPA is effectively utilizing its title 42 authority. If a scientist retires or moves on, the Agency would no longer be able to attract a suitable replacement if this amendment were to pass.

For those who think the EPA doesn't have adequate scientific basis for its regulations, they should be with me, and they should clearly vote against this amendment. We should be doing more to ensure that our environmental policies are being set by the best and the brightest. This amendment would ensure that the EPA can't recruit new scientists using its limited title 42 authority, which was given to them, to the EPA, in 2006 by a Republican Congress.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment. It is clear that this program does need the scrutiny of the authorizing committee. We are prepared to do that if this amendment passes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WESTMORELAND

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay legal fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, the United States is facing a crisis of executive overreach, and nowhere else is this more true than with the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA's escalation of sue and settle cases to change the law through Federal court rulings threatens our economy and the ability to create jobs, not to mention bypassing the normal rulemaking process. By operating hand in hand with radical environmental groups that are willing participants in these types of actions, the EPA's use of sue and settle not only endangers the economy but also our constitutional separation of powers.

Here is how it works:

An organization sues the EPA or an agency such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, demanding that the agency apply the law in a new, unintended, and expanded way that increases the agency's jurisdiction. The agency, rather than defending the law, enters into a consent decree with the party who filed the original lawsuit. A judge then signs the consent decree without significant review since the two disputing parties are in agreement. Suddenly, the agency has new, expansive powers to wield against job creators in the form of a legally binding settlement that creates rules and priorities outside of the normal rulemaking process. Between 2009 and 2012, the EPA chose not to defend itself in over 60 of these lawsuits from special interest advocacy groups. Those 60 lawsuits resulted in settlement agreements and in the EPA's publishing more than 100 new regulations.

Also included in these legally binding settlements are requirements that U.S. taxpayers must pay for the attorneys of the organization that initiated the action. According to a 2011 GAO report, between 1995 and 2010, three large environmental activist groups, like the Sierra Club, received almost $6 million in attorneys' fees alone. An example of sue and settle occurred with a start-up, shutdown, and malfunction rule. This was in response to a sue and settle agreement the EPA made with the Sierra Club in 2011.

As noted by Louisiana Senator DAVID VITTER in a letter to EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy in 2013:

Instead of defending the EPA's own regulations and the SSM provisions in the EPA-approved air programs of 39 States, the EPA simply agreed to include an obligation to respond to the petition in the settlement of an entirely separate lawsuit.

Sue and settle is made possible because, under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act, potential litigants are given broad standing to go to court because Congress has defined causes of action under these laws. Under my amendment, no funds can be used to pay legal fees under any settlement regarding any case arising under the three acts I mentioned—period, case closed, end of story. Litigants can still sue, but they will no longer be financially rewarded by the American taxpayer for their efforts.

I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment to reduce the secretive transfer of U.S. taxpayer dollars to other organizations. By restricting Federal agencies from having the ability to pay attorneys' fees, we will not only reduce Federal spending but also reduce the incentive for these self-interest groups to continue suing the Federal Government and taking American taxpayer dollars that could be used to reduce our Federal deficit.

It is inexcusable to require taxpayers to pay the legal bills of environmental groups to collude with the EPA in order to expand the Agency's abilities. This is one way Congress can fight the expansion of executive powers by this administration and its most out-of-control agency. With this amendment, Congress can ensure taxpayers are protected from funding the legal efforts of environmental advocacy organizations and from arming the EPA with draconian enforcement powers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the Equal Access to Justice Act is the law of the land. Within limits, it does allow for the Federal payment of legal fees to individuals and small businesses and nonprofits that are the prevailing parties in actions against Federal agencies unless the agency is able to show that the action was substantially justified or a special circumstance existed to make the award unjust. This law helps to deter government misconduct, and it encourages all parties, not just those with resources, to hire legal counsel to assert their rights.

I know that my colleagues, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, will agree with me that the ability to challenge Federal actions is the most important tool for ensuring government accountability. The Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the Endangered Species Act are also the law of the land, and these laws have contributed greatly to the protection and improvement of public health in this country. A study by a nonpartisan environmental law institute found that the Equal Access to

Justice Act has been cost-effective and only applies to meritorious litigation, and existing legal safeguards and the independent discretion of Federal judges will continue to ensure its prudent application. There are safeguards in place so that this can't be misused.

Moreover, the claim that large environmental groups are getting rich on attorneys' fees is not supported by available evidence. The 2011 GAO study, which was just referenced and was at the request of the House Republicans, brought cases against the EPA. They found that most of those suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorneys' fees were only awarded about 8 percent of the time; and among the environmental plaintiffs, the majority of those cases were brought by local groups rather than by national groups.

It is completely unfair to target these important environmental safeguards for removal from the protection of the Equal Access to Justice Act. More importantly, this amendment would have serious consequences for public health. In order for our Nation's environmental safeguards to work properly and ensure the protection of public health, citizens, including those with limited means, must have the ability to challenge Federal actions. This amendment is clearly designed to make it more difficult for regular citizens to ensure the accountability of the Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this does not prevent anybody from suing. This stops the EPA from this sue and settle—what I would call ''scam''—where it allows the groups or companies or whatever to come in and sue and allow them—I mentioned there were 60 different cases—the ability to make 100 new rulings that did not go through the normal rulemaking procedure but were done by court rulings.

I think it is appropriate that we not allow taxpayer dollars to be spent on these attorneys' fees that are being used to do this—to promote the Environmental Protection Agency. Rather than going through the regular rulemaking process, it is doing it by a court ruling.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the Equal Access to Justice Act is the law of the land. It allows for the Federal payment of legal fees, within limits, to individuals and small businesses and nonprofits which are the prevailing parties in actions against the Federal Government.

Again, we should be mindful of the 2011 GAO study that said, in cases brought against the EPA, it found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorneys' fees were only awarded in about 8 percent of the cases.

Citizens need to be able to hold their government accountable. They need to be able to petition their government, and that means a citizen with limited means. If that citizen wins and if the judge decides that it is just to award the costs, then that is the law of the land, which I support. Private citizens, regular citizens—citizens without means—can ensure that there is full accountability of the Federal Government to them. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0030

Mr. WESTMORELAND. As I would like to repeat, Mr. Chairman, this does not keep anybody from suing. The intent of this amendment is to keep the EPA from creating rules by judicial bodies rather than a normal rulemaking procedure.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROKITA

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REGARDING CERTAIN MUSSELS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to enforce the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) with respect to the Clubshell, Fanshell, Rabbitsfoot, Rayed Bean, Sheepnose, or Snuffbox mussels.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Indiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman CALVERT for managing the time tonight and for getting us to this point.

By my calculation, it has been 5 years since we have been able to have these kind of debates on the floor of the House, and here we are, at 12:30 at night.

Speaking for myself, I have listened to the entire debate here tonight on the floor, starting with votes after 6:30. Mr. Chairman, I was struck by the amount of amendments having to do with the Endangered Species Act, number one; and, number two, having to deal with the lists, whether threatened or endangered lists of Endangered Species Act.

Clearly—and I would agree with the gentlewoman on the other side of the aisle on this—reform and major reform of the Endangered Species Act is needed. That will take some time. That discussion has been ongoing.

It is nothing that hasn't already started in this Congress or in previous Congresses. I look forward to being a part of that solution in a very constructive way.

What about the near term? We have people, human constituents who are really suffering; and that is what my amendment, Mr. Chairman, is about tonight. Summer is a big time for any industry that depends on tourism to survive. I offer this amendment out of concern for two lake communities in my district.

Just last year, during the height of the summer's busy tourist season, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service required that the Northern Indiana Public Service Company, locally known as NIPSCO, release more water into the Tippecanoe River from Lake Freeman to protect a bed of endangered freshwater mussels that live further down the Tippecanoe River, all under the guise of the Endangered Species Act.

As a result, in a matter of days, water levels on Lake Freeman dropped dramatically. I have visited with local residents near Lake Freeman multiple times and have seen the lake in person. Growing up during the summers, I spent my time on the sister lake, Lake Shafer.

Many who live and work near the lake discovered, to their surprise, their boats were stuck, businesses were in jeopardy, and home values were going down; but more than that, stumps were rising out of the water, and personal health and safety were also in jeopardy as a result.

Now, I immediately contacted Fish and Wildlife, and I want to applaud them for their responsiveness and NIPSCO for working together. We created a technical assistance letter, otherwise known as a TAL. It is my estimation that that is going to have some effect. Again, I appreciate the reasonableness of all involved.

The current plan there is a temporary fix, and really, we ought to be able to do more. Now, currently, Fish and Wildlife receives funding to enforce the Endangered Species Act, which protects six species of mussels that live in the river, as the Clerk mentioned as he read the amendment.

The Endangered Species Act gives the highest priority to protected and listed species, and there is little anyone can do in terms of exceptions or exemptions or even any kind of balancing test to make sure that there is not a solution that could be a win-win. It is a very draconian law—strict compliance, no balancing test, no room for discretion or creative solution. That is where this reform is needed.

The statute, like I said, provides no balancing test for weighing the economic harms, and the Supreme Court

of this land has refused to allow us or even lower courts to construct their own test, us as citizens. Compliance with this law, as currently written, requires diverting water from Lake Freeman to the Tippecanoe River to balance water levels, despite consideration of the economic impact and human safety.

In essence, my amendment limits the funding mechanism Fish and Wildlife would be able to use to enforce the Endangered Species Act with respect to these six types of mussels and eliminates the financial repercussions for failing to enforce the law.

Speaking firsthand with residents, lowering these water levels in Lake Freeman negatively affects the community and small businesses that rely on the tourists who enjoy the lake and the steady water level. Lower water levels also pose dangerous swimming conditions to both boaters and swimmers as formerly underwater tree stumps breach the water. This is unnecessary and a preventable hazard to those who use the lake and, again, in a win-win way.

It is all because of this draconian law that, although well intended, is badly in need of reform so that its practical effect can be overhauled and any of its misguided applications halted.

Hoosiers, like myself, are just as concerned for the environment as they are for their incomes and family recreation. It is not about antienvironmentalism, but they believe, like I said, there is a win-win solution here, if only the law would allow such a solution to exist. In the meantime, we ought to defund Fish and Wildlife's ability to enforce this law as it is written.

While I value nature and seek to protect endangered animals, the reward of protecting the mussel does not outweigh the economic damage done to this community or the personal safety or health of my human constituents.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would, once again, prevent Fish and Wildlife Service from enforcing the Endangered Species Act with respect to six different species of mussel and would restrict the Fish and Wildlife Service from offering any of the critical protections to preserve these species.

This amendment is harmful and, in my opinion, misguided. Once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, it is a role of Fish and Wildlife Service—is primarily permissive, helping parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities, the TAL that the gentleman referred to.

Under this amendment, all the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply, but developers and landowners would have no avenue to comply with them. There could be no TAL. The Fish and Wildlife Service would be barred from issuing permits or exemptions.

This means landowners and industry and other parties who might need to take any of these six species of mussels would be vulnerable to a citizens suit. Additionally, this amendment would halt Fish and Wildlife Service enforcement of the Endangered Species Act, which has no effect on other Federal agencies that are funded outside of this bill.

The Endangered Species Act mandates that all Federal departments and agencies conserve listed species and use their authorities in furthering the purpose of this act.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act stipulates that any Federal agency that carries out, permits, licenses, funds, or otherwise authorizes activities that may affect all listed species must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that its actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species.

This amendment would stop—stop—section 7 consultation requirements for Federal agencies; rather, it would prohibit Fish and Wildlife from completing these consultations. That means a bridge or a highway project permitted or funded through the Federal Highway Administration or power projects permitted by the Department of Energy would be vulnerable to delays and stoppages and other potential lawsuits.

This amendment, in my opinion, is an all-out assault on the Endangered Species Act. In one fell swoop, it would block protections for six different species that are currently listed as threatened or endangered; but, regardless of one's position on the Endangered Species Act, it is just a bad amendment.

The gentleman's amendment will create uncertainty for developers, landowners, leaving them vulnerable to lawsuits. I don't think that was the gentleman's original intention, but that is the effect it will have because it will block section 7 consultations, gumming up permitting processing across the Federal Government, delaying projects, and adversely impacting the economy.

The amendment is bad for the environment. It is bad for the economy. It is bad for business. It is bad for the highways and energy projects. It is just bad for this bill. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ATTORNEY FEES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay attorney fees in a civil suit under section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)) pursuant to a court order that states such fees were calculated at an hourly rate in excess of $125 per hour.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support for the good work Chairman CALVERT and the subcommittee have done on this bill.

This amendment, which I offered with my colleagues Representatives BILL HUIZENGA and BILL FLORES, aligns attorney fee award limits for Endangered Species Act lawsuits with award limits for other lawsuits against the Federal Government established by the Equal Access to Justice Act.

The Equal Access to Justice Act generally limits the hourly rate for awards of fees to prevailing attorneys to a reasonable $125 per hour. However, no such fee cap exists under the Endangered Species Act. As a result, ESA litigants are being awarded sums, in many cases, in excess of $600 per hour.

The Equal Access to Justice Act was not intended as an extraordinary access to taxpayer dollars for environmental attorneys. Indeed, we heard one of my colleagues a minute ago talk about sue and settle.

According to the GAO, the Department of the Interior paid out over $27 million in attorney fees between 2001 and 2010; $21 million of those payments were for Endangered Species Act lawsuits. Many of them settled with no court order, finding the litigants to have prevailed on the merits of the case—no finding.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we close this loophole that enables excessive payouts to groups that have made a business of suing the Federal Government. There is simply no reason that one sort of lawsuit, a type commonly undertaken by entities solely engaged in continuous litigation against the government, should be paid more than any other.

Representative HUIZENGA sponsored a measure addressing this issue last session, which was passed by the Committee on Natural Resources. I urge your support, which would be very much appreciated, including by people like my daughter whose birthday it is tonight, so they would have a chance to be in business and not have these extraordinarily high fees.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would prohibit funds in the act from being used to pay attorney fees in excess of $125 per hour for the Endangered Species Act civil suits.

Now, perhaps the gentleman is not aware that the Equal Access to Justice Act caps attorney fees at $125 per hour unless the court—the court—determines that an increase in the cost of living or special factors, such as the limited availability of qualified attorneys for the proceedings involved, justifies the higher fee.

□ 0045

So it would be the court that would determine that. But the fee is capped at $125 an hour. This is unnecessary and it is a redundant amendment. Attorney fees for the Endangered Species Act cases, as I said, are already capped at $125 per hour, unless special criteria are stipulated by the Equal Access Justice Court.

This amendment would effectively change that implementation of the Equal Access Justice Act for one specific policy area: the Endangered Species Act.

Again, higher attorney fees are only permitted in cases where specific criteria under the Endangered Species Act are met. At best, this amendment is redundant; at worst, it is a backdoor attempt to undermine the Endangered Species Act protections and make access to justice a lot less equal.

In closing, Mr. Chair, we don't need any extraneous, redundant provisions to a bill that is already overburdened with harmful legislative riders. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate the comments by my colleague from Minnesota here, but it has been very unequal already, with many, many cases being paid out at $600, $700 per hour. So this amendment seeks to actually put that cap on there. There will still be the ability for a court, in extraordinary circumstances, to make the decision of whether it should be higher.

But I am glad I am not in the position, like my colleague from Minnesota, of defending $600 or $700 an hour for attorney fees for more frivolous environmental lawsuits that make it difficult to farm, ranch, mine, and do timber operations which are desperately needed, especially with the conditions we have in California, with our forests as well as the drought situation and trying to get work done to address that.

So when the people watch what goes on here, they need to be cognizant that there are those in the government that would rather pay to $600 to $700 per hour for more frivolous environmental lawsuits while they suffer from drought or burning forests.

With that, I think that this amendment is very much in order because we see that these limits aren't being followed at all under the $125 limit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title), the following:

SEC.____. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used in contravention of 33 U.S.C. 1319 with respect to a permit issued or required to be issued to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1344 for discharges of dredged or fill material impacting wetlands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, Americans are tired of two standards: a standard whereby private citizens are treated one way and a standard whereby the Federal Government treats themselves in an entirely different way.

Nothing is more apparent in this situation than where the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers grants themselves one way of complying with wetlands regulations, yet they impose an entirely different standard upon our private citizens.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA go out and purport to be defenders of wetlands; good stewards of our wetlands. Yet the greatest cause of wetlands loss in the United States is actually caused by historic current and future actions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

In our home State of Louisiana, we have lost over 1,900 square miles of our coast, and the majority of that land loss has been caused by the management or the mismanagement by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of our coastal resources and the river resources, particularly the Mississippi River.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is it simply requires that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers comply with the same standards as anything else. If there are permits required, they have to get them. If there are mitigation requirements, they have to get them. They can no longer mismanage our coastal resources.

This isn't a parochial. This is an issue whereby the Nation truly benefits from this. This is the area where fishery production occurs, energy production occurs. We literally power this Nation's economy and we feed American families.

So this wetlands loss that we are experiencing actually increases the vulnerability of our coastal communities in south Louisiana and increases the demands upon FEMA and other agencies in response to disasters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

Sec. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used on an unmanned aircraft system or to operate any such system owned by the Department of the Interior for the performance of surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data.

Mr. PERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me to offer this amendment. It prevents the Department of the Interior from competing with our local job creators in the use of UAS—unmanned aerial systems—for land surveying, mapping, imaging, and remote sensing data activities.

There is concern that agencies like the USGS and the Bureau of Land Management are acquiring the UAS and utilizing them on projects that can be accomplished by the private sector. We have no problem with them using them. We have no problem with them using them for forest fires and those types of things, for emergency situations, but where local businesses can do this work, we think that it is unfair

for the government to take that work away.

Having the Department compete with local employers results in a loss of business for private geospatial firms under contract to other Federal mapping agencies. The government is actually getting a leg up on the private market by obtaining Certificates of Authorization, or COAs, and performing services with UAS that are otherwise commercial in nature.

Current law and regulation permits private citizens and firms to operate UAS for a hobby. However, there is no effective enforcement to prevent government abuse of such authority for commercial purposes.

The fact that government agencies can operate a UAS while the private sector cannot as freely or timely gain airspace access has created and uneven playing field. Allowing the Department of the Interior to compete with the free market use of UAS is not only poor stewardship of taxpayer money and inefficient use of resources, but results in the government duplicating and directly competing with private enterprise.

This is a $73 million marketplace, Mr. Chairman. It drives more than $1 trillion in economic activity. More than 500,000 American jobs are related to the collection, storage, and dissemination of imagery and geospatial data. Another 5.3 million citizens utilize such data. As much as 90 percent of the government information has a geospatial information component. Up to 80 percent of the information managed by business is connected to a specific location. The geospatial marketplace is identified by the Department of Labor as one of just 14 high gross sectors in the United States workforce.

With that, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. The Department of the Interior and the U.S. Geological Survey have been using unmanned aircraft to complement conventional satellite-based remote sensing. Using remote sensing via unmanned aircraft did make sense. It allows for the rapid collection of data and allows for the Department to get a closer look at natural disasters as they develop.

The Department and the USGS are using unmanned aircraft to monitor the spread of wildfires, monitor riverbank erosion, detect and locate coal steam fires, conduct waterfall surveys, and inspect abandoned mines.

It is clearly evident to everyone that this technology offers a real public safety benefit. So it makes no sense to hamstring the Department when the technology can save lives and the survey can monitor dangerous natural events.

Now, the way that the amendment is written—and I am all for the private sector being able to do things, and that is in your new amendment, that the private sector is not affected by this amendment—if the private sector currently isn't operating in this space looking at abandoned mines or looking at wildfires and we need to do something right away, your amendment would prohibit the Federal Government from using equipment it would have and be able to launch up and look at something in real time.

I don't think that was the total intention of your amendment. But because even though you worked in the redraft to make sure that you protected contractors—and I am glad you did that—I don't know where that leaves us in times of emergency when there isn't a contractor available, because you haven't allowed prohibition.

For that reason, Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

First of all, I did state that fire observation would not be included. Indeed, it is not written in the amendment. It is very specific. So for emergency purposes, if need be, the Department of the Interior still can use, whether it uses its own or DHS' or one of the other myriad agencies that have the vehicles, it still has the ability to do that.

But I would also remind the gentlewoman that there are plenty of ambulance services and other emergency services for contract hire out there in our communities that perform emergency services every hour of the day, every day of the year. That fact notwithstanding, the private industry does provide all the other things that the agency is currently embarking on on its own and leaving the private sector out.

A friend just called me today and asked me, because I am a helicopter pilot in the Army, if we could put his air-conditioning unit on a roof. I said, ''Absolutely not.'' The Army doesn't do what the civilian world does for good reason. We want the civilians out there doing those things. We don't want to compete as the Federal Government.

But in this case, the Department of the Interior is competing directly, and will continue to do if allowed to do so, unless prohibited. They can write contracts, and they can have somebody on call. If there is an emergency situation, they can have a contractor on call to do that, and they should.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman.

I think that this is a great discussion we are having, but I don't think the discussion necessarily belongs on the appropriations bill. It belongs in the policy committee so that all the questions that I have and the concerns that you have can be addressed and thoughtfully written into a piece of legislation.

There are just some places in rural parts of the United States—and I come from a State that is both urban, suburban, and very rural, up on the north shore—where private contractors just don't go or the ability of getting a hold of one isn't there, and sometimes you have to have some Federal redundancy in the system to get out there and do that.

You also have used a couple of terms and descriptions that I don't have any statutory language in front of me. So where I think the gentleman might have a very good idea, bills that we are working on in the appropriations process, when we start getting into writing technical policy or trying to figure out the new wave of what new legislation should look like—and you have a great proponent; I hear him all the time in the Defense subcommittee—the chairman of the subcommittee says the Federal Government shouldn't be doing what the private sector can do. We should not be doing this legislation for the reasons I mentioned, that we just don't have all the facts in front of it, and it is not the role of the Interior Appropriations bill to do policy.

So I am going to continue to object to the amendment at this time, but I look forward to, in a policy situation, working with the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Again, I appreciate the gentlewoman's reservations and opposition for the reasons so stated. I respect them, but I feel this is the correct place to limit in the appropriations, to make sure that the private sector can compete effectively and is allowed to do so and doesn't have to compete against the Federal Government with all the provisions it has at its hand to undermine their ability to be effective and competitive.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 0100

Mr. CALVERT. 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. PERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. LOUDERMILK, 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. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

May 19, 2015:

H.R. 2252. An Act to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

May 22, 2015:

H.R. 606. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

H.R. 651. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the ''Sister Ann Keefe Post Office''.

H.R. 1075. An Act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the ''Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry''.

H.R. 1191. An Act to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iraq's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2496. An Act to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

May 29, 2015:

H.R. 1690. An Act to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the ''Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 2353. An Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

June 2, 2015:

H.R. 2048. An Act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

June 29, 2015:

H.R. 1295. An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2146. An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1966 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

May 19, 2015:

S. 665. An Act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

May 22, 2015:

S. 1124. An Act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

May 29, 2015:

S. 178. An Act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

June 12, 2015:

S. 802. An Act to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

June 15, 2015:

S. 1568. An Act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Friday, June 26, 2015.

H.R. 893. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1295. An act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, and preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 24, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2146. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

H.R. 615. To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 26, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1295. To extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

H.R. 893. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

H.R. 533. To revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 8, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1981. A letter from the Program Manager, BioPreferred Program, DM/OPPM/EMD, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Voluntary Labeling Program for Biobased Products (RIN: 0599-AA22) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1982. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the expected submission date of the report on inventory of activities performed during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to contracts for services for or on behalf of the Department of Defense, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1983. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1984. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Ronnie D. Hawkins, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1985. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, OUSD (AT&L) DPAP/DARS, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Defense Contractors Outside the United States — Subpart Relocation (DFARS Case 2015-D015) (RIN: 0750-AI55) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1986. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stephen L. Hoog, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1987. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers on an enclosed list to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, as indicated, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1988. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, OUSD (AT&L) DPAP/DARS, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Clauses with Alternates-

Prescriptions and Clause Prefaces (DFARS Case 2015-D016) (RIN: 0750-AI57) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1989. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, OUSD (AT&L) DPAP/DARS, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings (DFARS Case 2013-D022) (RIN: 0750-AI04) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1990. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, OUSD (AT&L) DPAP/DARS, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds (DFARS Case 2014-D025) (RIN: 0750-AI43) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1991. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the ''Report to the U.S. Congress on Global Export Credit Competition'' for the period covering January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 8A of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1992. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the ''Barriers to Industrial Energy Efficiency'' report, pursuant to the American Energy Manufacturing Technical Corrections Act, Pub. L. 112-210; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1993. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the report entitled ''The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran'', pursuant to Sec. 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1994. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Packaged Terminal Air Conditioners and Packaged Terminal Heat Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-TP-0032] (RIN: 1904-AD19) received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1995. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''Health Profession Opportunity Grants Program and Evaluation Portfolio Interim Report to Congress'', pursuant to Sec. 5507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. 111-148; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1996. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Infant Formula: The Addition of Minimum and Maximum Levels of Selenium to Infant Formula and Related Labeling Requirements [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0067] received June 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1997. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterinary Feed Directive; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2010-N-0155] (RIN: 0910-AG95) received June 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1998. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0079; FRL-9929-69-Region 6] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1999. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0649; FRL-9928-93] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2000. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Technical Amendments to the Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities — Correction of the Effective Date [EPA-HQ-RCRA-2015-0331; FRL-9928-44-OSWER] (RIN: 2050-AE81) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2001. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; Memphis, TN-MS-AR Emissions Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0247; FRL-9929-84-Region 4] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2002. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Sheboygan County, Wisconsin 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Reasonable Further Progress Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0075; FRL-9929-73-Region 5] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2003. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval of Alabama's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Birmingham, Alabama [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0905; FRL-9929-91-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS58) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2004. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Alabama's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Birmingham, Alabama [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0905; FRL-9929-90-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS58) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2005. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cuprous oxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0865; FRL-9929-51] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2006. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Plantwide Applicability Limit Permitting Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0378; FRL-9929-81-Region 6] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2007. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Performance Specification 18 — Performance Specifications and Test Procedures for Hydrogen Chloride Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems at Stationary Sources [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0696; FRL-9929-25-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR81) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2008. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prohexadione calcium; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0346; FRL-9927-25] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2009. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revising Underground Storage Tank Regulations — Revisions to Existing Requirements and New Requirements for Secondary Containment and Operator Training [EPA-HQ-UST-2011-0301; FRL-9913-64-OSWER] (RIN: 2050-AG46) received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2010. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Lifeline and Link Up Reform [WC Docket No.: 11-42] received June 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2011. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security — CCR, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Emergency Alert System [EB Docket No.: 04-296] received June 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2012. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed item to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009 delegation of authority (74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2013. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting pursuant to Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies

Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2014. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2015. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-91, ''Access to Contraceptives Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2016. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-90, ''Healthy Hearts of Babies Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2017. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-94, ''Fiscal Year 2015 Second Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2018. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-92, ''Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Exception Temporary Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2019. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-93, ''Youth Employment and Work Readiness Training Temporary Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2020. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2021. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis 2014 management report and financial statements, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-576; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2022. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Potomac Electric Power Company, transmitting a copy of the Balance Sheet of Potomac Electric Power Company as of December 31, 2014, pursuant to D.C. Code Ann. Sec. 34-1113 (2001); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2023. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD920) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2024. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final specifications — Pacific Island Fisheries; 2014-15 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures; Main Hawaiian Islands Deep 7 Bottomfish [Docket No.: 140113035-5475-02] (RIN: 0648-XD082) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2025. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; the Highly Migratory Species Fishery; Closure [Docket No.: 031125294-4091-02] (RIN: 0648-XD945) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2026. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2015-2016 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 140904754-5188-02] (RIN: 0648-BF08) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2027. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Amendment 29 [Docket No.: 141107936-5399-02] (RIN: 0648-BE55) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2028. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery in the ELAPS in 2015 [Docket No.: 150406346-5346-01] (RIN: 0648-XD972) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2029. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic Region [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02] (RIN: 0648-XD962) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2030. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Groundfish Fishery; Framework Adjustment 53 [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-BE75) received July 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2031. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report summary for FY 2015 of the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, pursuant to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act, 31 U.S.C. 6901-6907, as amended; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2032. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a letter containing the Web site address for the calendar year 2014 report on bankruptcy statistics mandated by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. 159(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2033. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications as required by Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Pub. L. 90-351 Sec. 802, and codified at 18 U.S.C. Sec. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2034. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a copy of the charter for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights state advisory committees, pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 41 C.F.R. Sec. 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2035. A letter from the Auditor, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, transmitting the annual financial report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America for calendar year 2014, pursuant to Pub. L. 88-504 and 36 U.S.C. 1101; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2036. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the ''2014 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics'', pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(w)(3) and 997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jupiter, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0794; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-5] received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2038. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0489; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-003-AD; Amendment 39-18175; AD 2015-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2039. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0568; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-075-AD; Amendment 39-18166; AD 2015-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2040. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1936; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-005-AD; Amendment 39-18170; AD 2015-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2041. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Helicopters

[Docket No.: FAA-2015-1937; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-067-AD; Amendment 39-18171; AD 2015-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2042. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0464; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-002-AD; Amendment 39-18169; AD 2015-11-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2043. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0342; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-18168; AD 2015-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2044. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0756; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-103-AD; Amendment 39-18167; AD 2015-11-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2045. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0584; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-18158; AD 2015-10-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2046. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1003; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-33-AD; Amendment 39-18163; AD 2015-10-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2047. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Seats France (formerly Sicma Aero Seat) Passenger Seat Assemblies [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1282; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-18157; AD 2015-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2048. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines Reciprocating Engines (Type Certificate previously held by Textron Lycoming Division, AVCO Corporation) [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0940; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-15-AD; Amendment 39-18162; AD 2015-10-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2049. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Slingsby Aviation Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1737; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-18164; AD 2015-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2050. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1100; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-37-AD; Amendment 39-18159; AD 2015-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (previously Eurocopter France) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1570; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-054-AD; Amendment 39-18161; AD 2015-10-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Lexington, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0969; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-20] received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Clarksburg, WV [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1003; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-9] received June 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2054. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Minor New Source Review Requirements [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0225; FRL-9930-08-Region 3] received June 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2055. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting annual compilation of financial disclosure statements of the members of the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics for the period between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2014, pursuant to Clause 3 of House Rule XXVI; (H. Doc. No. 114—46); to the Committee on Ethics and ordered to be printed.

2056. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Division, American Legion, transmitting the consolidated financial statements of the American Legion as of December 31, 2014 and 2013 with supplemental data; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2057. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to Secs. 402(a) and 409(a) of Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (''the Jackson-Vanik Amendment''); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2058. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Elder Justice Coordinating Council 2012-2014 Report to Congress, pursuant to Title XX of the Social Security Act, Subtitle B, the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2059. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year 2012'', pursuant to Sec. 1161 of the Social Security Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2060. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2015 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to Pub. L. 100-647, Sec. 7105; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2061. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 26th actuarial valuation of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to Sec. 22 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 and Pub. L. 98-76, Sec. 502; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 6. A bill to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of 21st century cures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–190, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the While House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2256. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report on the Veterans Health Administration and the furnishing of hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care by the Department of Veterans Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. 114–191). Referred to the Committee of the While House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 347. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, and providing consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act and improve forest management activities in units of the National Forest System derived from the public domain, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–192). Referred to the House calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 6 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TROTT (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2947. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code in order to facilitate the resolution of an insolvent financial institution in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2948. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an incremental expansion of telehealth coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 2949. A bill to exclude payments from State eugenics compensation programs from consideration in determining eligibility for, or the amount of, Federal public benefits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TAKAI:

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to streamline and clarify small business contracting opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2951. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance to countries that do not prohibit shark finning in the territorial waters of the country or the importation, sale, or possession of shark fins obtained as a result of shark finning; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2952. A bill to provide payments to States for increasing the employment, job retention, and earnings of former TANF recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2953. A bill to expand the Moving to Work and Rental Assistance demonstration programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 2954. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the ''Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to expand the cause of action relating to the pattern or practice of conduct by a governmental authority that deprives a person of rights protected by the Constitution to such conduct relating to adults as well as juveniles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the earned income tax credit to citizens and lawful permanent residents and to require a valid social security number to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2957. A bill to reauthorize the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2958. A bill to fulfill the United States Government's trust responsibility to serve the higher education needs of the Navajo people and to clarify, unify, and modernize prior Diné College legislation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2959. A bill to prevent States from counting certain expenditures as State spending to reduce TANF work requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa):

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to aid gifted and talented and high-ability learners by empowering the Nation's teachers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 2961. A bill to establish a research, development, and technology demonstration program to improve the efficiency of gas turbines used in combined cycle and simple cycle power generation systems; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 59. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of ''waters of the United States'' under the Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MARINO, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BASS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CARNEY):

H. Res. 348. A resolution supporting the right of the people of Ukraine to freely elect their government and determine their future; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 2947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes;'' Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to establish . . . uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;'' Article I, Section 8, clause 9 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;'' Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;'' and, Article III of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation defines or affects powers of the Judiciary that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 2949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. TAKAI:

H.R. 2950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article VIII of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 2951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section 1, which gives Congress the authority to ''ordain and establish'' courts inferior to theSupreme Court.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 2956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8 (18) To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department ot Officer thereof.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of US Constitution, to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.J. Res. 59.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of commerce among the several states.)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 136: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 140: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 156: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 210: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 213: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 244: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 282: Mr. HARPER and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 343: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 353: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 356: Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 358: Ms. NORTON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 376: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 411: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 423: Mr. MARINO and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 427: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 430: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 448: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 475: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 540: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COLE, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 546: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 563: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 592: Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 605: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 607: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 612: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 619: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 632: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 649: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 653: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 662: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 667: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 671: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 672: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 675: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 680: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 684: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 700: Ms. MOORE and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 702: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 731: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 746: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 757: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 759: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 775: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 784: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 793: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 800: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 815: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 816: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 822: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 840: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 846: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 858: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 865: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 869: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 879: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 907: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 915: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 921: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 923: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 969: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 985: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 989: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 990: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 997: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 1073: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1148: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 1151: Mr. REED and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1188: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1197: Ms. BASS and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1209: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1211: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1218: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1221: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1232: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1233: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1247: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1248: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1274: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1283: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1299: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1300: Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1310: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1312: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1321: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1336: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1338: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1342: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1344: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1354: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1384: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1434: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1466: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1467: Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1475: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. MCSALLY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1479: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YODER, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1514: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1516: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1523: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MESSER, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1526: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1533: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1550: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1552: Ms. MENG and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1555: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 1559: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1566: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1567: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. Polis.

H.R. 1571: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1598: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1610: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1611: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1624: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WALDEN, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1632: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1635: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 1643: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1671: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1684: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1694: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1708: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1714: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1718: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1726: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1728: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1737: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1763: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1768: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1769: Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1779: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1786: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1836: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1854: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1855: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1861: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 1887: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1901: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 1910: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1919: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1933: Mr. WELCH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1940: Mr. YOHO and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1953: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1961: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1964: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1974: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1977: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1978: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1994: Mr. BARR and Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 2030: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2050: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2061: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2067: Mr. WELCH and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2076: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2096: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2125: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2133: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2140: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2141: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2156: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2191: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2201: Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 2211: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 2237: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2253: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2257: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2280: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2283: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2287: Mr. BARR and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2290: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2295: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2302: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2315: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 2329: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2342: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2380: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2400: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2403: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2404: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2410: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BASS, and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2429: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 2460: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2461: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2477: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2493: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELÁZGUEZ, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2494: Mr. KILMER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2498: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2520: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2530: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2540: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2602: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2607: Mr. REED.
H.R. 2615: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2627: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2643: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2646: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2669: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 2680: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2689: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2698: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2704: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2716: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2719: Mr. POCAN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2722: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2726: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2734: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2737: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2738: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2739: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2740: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 2742: Ms. MOORE and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2752: Mr. COLE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2761: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2762: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2773: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POLIS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2775: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2777: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2788: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2794: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2798: Mr. POCAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2799: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2802: Mr. FLORES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H.R. 2805: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 2810: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 2811: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2820: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 2835: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2836: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2838: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2847: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2866: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2867: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2871: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2875: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2894: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 2897: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2902: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2903: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2906: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2909: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 2915: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2916: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2917: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2919: Mr. BUCK.
H.R. 2920: Ms. HAHN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2922: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2927: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HARDY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2934: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2937: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2938: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2939: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 2942: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.J. Res. 32: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. JORDAN.
H.J. Res. 52: Mr. POLIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. SINEMA.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. ESTY.
H. Con. Res. 53: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 12: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H. Res. 17: Mr. FLORES.
H. Res. 112: Ms. TSONGAS.
H. Res. 147: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H. Res. 193: Mr. HUNTER.
H. Res. 209: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. WOMACK.
H. Res. 210: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. POCAN.
H. Res. 230: Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. BLACK.

H. Res. 236: Mr. CARNEY.

H. Res. 270: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H. Res. 279: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 289: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 290: Mr. GOWDY.

H. Res. 291: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H. Res. 293: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 310: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HANNA, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 318: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The amendment I filed for H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 or rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative POLIS or a designee, to H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, Austin, Texas, relative to requesting the enactment of legislation by Congress to create a new $25 denomination of United States paper currency bearing the likeness of former Member of Congress Jeannette Rankin of Montana on the front of that new denomination and mandating that the image of Alexander Hamilton remain intact on the existing $10 American paper currency denomination; which was referred to the Committee on Financial Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MS. TSONGAS

AMENDMENT NO. 40: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE SPECIFIC SECTIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 117, 121, or 122.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. ROUZER

AMENDMENT NO. 41: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces'' published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 16, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 13671 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MS. EDWARDS

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Strike section 438.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 43: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CONSIDER A PETITION TO RECLASSIFY THE WEST INDIAN MANATEE

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consider a petition to reclassify the West Indian manatee from an endangered species to a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 44: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CARRY OUT OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 226

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out oil and gas lease sale 226 for the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT NO. 45: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. PEARCE

AMENDMENT NO. 46: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to increase the rate of any royalty required to be paid to the United States for oil and gas produced on Federal land, or to prepare or publish a proposed rule relating to such an increase.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MS. SPEIER

AMENDMENT NO. 47: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule following the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Dog Management Plan (Plan/SEIS), Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), California (78 Fed. Reg. 55094; September 9, 2013).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. GOODLATTE

AMENDMENT NO. 48: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the backstop actions referred to in enclosure B of the December 29, 2009, letter from EPA's Regional Administration to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State's watershed implementation plan.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. YODER

AMENDMENT NO. 49: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE THREATENED SPECIES LISTING OF THE LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the lesser prairie chicken under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13693.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. GARAMENDI

AMENDMENT NO. 51: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

None of the funds made available by this Act for California drought response or relief may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Secretary of the Interior in contravention of implementation of Division 26.7 of the California Water Code (the Water Quality, Supply, and Infrastructure Improvement Act of 2014), as approved by the voters of California in California Proposition 1 (2014).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. JEFFRIES

AMENDMENT NO. 52: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available to the National Park Service by this Act may be used for the purchase or display of a confederate flag with the exception of specific circumstances where the flags provide historical context as described in the National Park Service memorandum entitled ''Immediate Action Required, No Reply Needed: Confederate Flags'' and dated June 24, 2015.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. NOEM

AMENDMENT NO. 53: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO CLOSE OR MOVE FISHERIES ARCHIVES

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to close or move the D.C. Booth Historic National Fish Hatchery and Archives.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. NEWHOUSE

AMENDMENT NO. 54: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT GRAY WOLVES IN WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND UTAH AS ENDANGERED SPECIES OR THREATENED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Interior or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to treat any gray wolf (*Canis*

lupus) in Washington, Oregon, or Utah as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUFFMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 55: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a new contract or agreement or to administer a portion of an existing contract or agreement with a concessioner, a cooperating association, or any other entity that provides for the sale in any facility within a unit of the National Park System of a non-educational item that depicts a Confederate flag on it.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUFFMAN

AMENDMENT NO. 56: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to permit, authorize, or allow any grave in any Federal cemetery to be decorated with a Confederate flag.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. GALLEGO

AMENDMENT NO. 57: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a grazing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. BURGESS

AMENDMENT NO. 58: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. LAMALFA

AMENDMENT NO. 59: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ATTORNEY FEES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay attorney fees in a civil suit under section 11(g) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1540(g)) pursuant to a court order that states such fees were calculated at an hourly rate in excess of $125 per hour.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. NEWHOUSE

AMENDMENT NO. 60: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue any regulation under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) that applies to an animal feeding operation, including a concentrated animal feeding operation and a large concentrated animal feeding operation, as such terms are defined in section 122.23 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. ROKITA

AMENDMENT NO. 61: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REGARDING CERTAIN MUSSELS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to enforce the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) with respect to the Clubshell, Fanshell, Rabbitsfoot, Rayed Bean, Sheepnose, or Snuffbox mussels.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WESTMORELAND

AMENDMENT NO. 62: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay legal fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).