

length, height and depth of Your love which surpasses all knowledge.

Now to You, by whom the power at work within us, is able to do far more than we can ask or imagine, to You be the glory today and always.

Hear these our prayers and those unspoken as we offer them in the strength of Your sovereign name.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. CARL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. PLASKETT 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.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and acknowledge National Agriculture Week. This week we take the opportunity to recognize the central role that agriculture plays in the economy across the country and my home in the State of Ohio.

Agriculture is one of Ohio's largest industries, supplying one out of every seven jobs. However, our Nation is experiencing a mounting agricultural trade deficit which has nearly doubled in the last year, according to the Department of Agriculture. This deficit

has had a large impact on Ohio farm economies and American leadership in international agricultural trade.

We should be committed to delivering an updated farm bill that ensures long-term growth and addresses the unique needs of America's farmers, ranchers, and consumers.

As we celebrate National Agriculture Week, let's work together to create new markets for American agricultural products, drive rural economic development, and strengthen domestic energy resources.

### VIRGIN ISLANDS' WOMEN FIGHTERS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, well before equality for women was discussed in the U.S. mainland, the Virgin Islands have lauded, uplifted, and seen women fighters and leaders.

All Virgin Islands' children know the stories of our queens, but our girls have a wealth of women who have sacrificed their time, privacy, and professions in elected leadership.

Most recently, women like my soul sisters Alicia Barnes and Diane Capehart; sorors Janette Millin Young and Allison DeGazon; Marise James; Donna Frett-Gregory; Genevieve Whitaker; Janelle Sarauw; Carla Joseph; Alma Heyliger; our recently departed Alicia "Chucky" Hansen; our first women elected in 1954: Lucinda Millin and Ruby Rouss; local Senate's first female president Cleone Cregue in 1977, who won the first territorial-wide race; and, of course, Donna Christensen, my predecessor, the first female physician to serve in Congress; Lorraine Berry, Carol Burke; Carmen Wesselhoft; Lilliana Belardo; Anne Golden; and Norma Pickard. The list goes on of strong, fervent, and resilient women who shape our path and ignite our future.

They are VI strong.

### HONORING SECRETARY MARCIA FUDGE ON HER RETIREMENT

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a shining example of a public servant, a fierce advocate for northeast Ohio, my friend and colleague, Secretary Marcia Fudge. Secretary Fudge recently announced her retirement after more than 50 years of public service.

For decades, Secretary Fudge served our northeast Ohio community with passion, dedication, and determination. I can say that for a fact because Secretary Fudge used to be my Member of Congress. She represented Ohio's 11th Congressional District.

I have had the privilege of working alongside her as we both served the

Akron community, including when I was in the statehouse where we worked to improve access to affordable housing, protecting our freedoms to vote, and advancing racial and gender equality.

Just last month I hosted Secretary Fudge back in Ohio's 13th district to highlight the Department of Housing and Urban Development's investments in affordable housing and support for first-time home buyers.

Secretary Fudge truly transformed HUD, leading the agency through unprecedented housing challenges during the pandemic, fighting housing discrimination, and ensuring no one was left out or left behind.

I am grateful for her and her leadership, and I wish her the best in her retirement. I thank Madam Secretary Marcia Fudge for being a dedicated and clear public servant.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1023, REPEALING OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION FUND; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1121, PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6009, RESTORING AMERICAN ENERGY DOMINANCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 86, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 987, DENOUNCING THE HARMFUL, ANTI-AMERICAN ENERGY POLICIES OF THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7023, CREATING CONFIDENCE IN CLEAN WATER PERMITTING ACT

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1085 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1085

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1023) to repeal section 134 of the Clean Air Act, relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-26 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the

bill (H.R. 1121) to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6009) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw the proposed rule relating to fluid mineral leases and leasing process, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 987) denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

SEC. 6. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7023) to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of

the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-25 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARL). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1215

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

House Resolution 1085 provides for consideration of six measures: H.R. 1023, H.R. 1121, H.R. 6009, H. Con. Res. 86, H. Res. 987, and H.R. 7023.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1023, the Cutting Green Corruption and Taxes Act, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1121, the Protecting American Energy Production Act, that being under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

Further, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6009, the Restoring American Energy Dominance Act, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 86, expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy, that being under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 987, denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7023, the Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act, under a structured rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule makes in order eight amendments.

Mr. Speaker, since President Joe Biden took office, energy costs for Americans have risen by 28.6 percent. On January 20, 2021, a gallon of gasoline was—wait for it—\$2.39.

During President Biden's Presidency, the average price has reached a record high of \$5 a gallon. This is a direct result of the President's dangerous, extreme, far-left agenda, the Green New Deal agenda that spent trillions of dollars and enacted costly regulations on the American family.

The underlying legislation before us this week will help unlock and unleash American energy independence and block President Biden's war on the American worker and American energy.

For example, H.R. 1023 will eliminate \$27 billion of Green New Deal slush funds for coastal elites and Chinese Communists. We know China dominates the extraction, processing, and production of rare earth elements and critical minerals. Solar panels, windmills, and EVs all rely heavily on these materials, which further deepens our dependency on Communist China.

This legislation will also repeal the proposed natural gas tax that will burden so many American energy producers in southwestern Pennsylvania and across this Nation.

In addition, H.R. 1121 will block the President from declaring a moratorium on hydraulic fracking. In 2019, then-candidate Joe Biden expressed his support to ban fracking. The President said: "We would make sure it is eliminated," when asked about the future of coal and fracking. Then, in March 2020, he said: "No more new fracking."

That is why, this week, House Republicans will block his ability to ban fracking.

Lastly, H.R. 7023 will build upon the progress under H.R. 1 and the Fiscal Responsibility Act to help reform our permitting process. This bill will streamline the permitting process under the Clean Water Act, instructing the administration to issue guidance that complies with the Supreme Court ruling in *Sackett v. EPA* and protect permit holders from frivolous lawsuits.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of a partisan package of pro-polluter energy and environmental bills. Half of these bills have already been considered by the House last year, and the other half are toothless resolutions simply declaring a sense of Congress, albeit a partisan sense of Congress. A package like this is what we have come to expect from this Republican majority in the House.

In the 118th Congress, Republicans can rarely find agreement with each other, let alone negotiate bipartisan legislation capable of being passed by both Houses and signed into law by the President. Therefore, what we get week in and week out are old bills chopped up and repackaged to give Republicans something to talk about for the week while we all wait for the next budget crisis deadline.

Republicans have run the House for the past 15 months and have used that precious time not to lead but to pick fights and air grievances. As my Republican colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas, keeps reminding us, House Republicans have nothing to show for their majority. They haven't done anything to address the most important issues confronting America.

Let's look at the record of this feckless Republican majority thus far.

House Republicans spent a month fighting with each other to pick a Speaker, only to kick out Kevin McCarthy a few months later and spend another month selecting the current Speaker.

House Republicans brought the country to the brink of fiscal calamity to

extort a budget deal that they then failed to honor.

House Republicans walked out of a bipartisan deal to overhaul the immigration system after claiming it was their number one priority.

House Republicans are blocking bipartisan legislation to provide military aid to Ukraine and our allies.

Also, House Republicans are blocking a funding package for increased border security.

Although we hope to finish the 2024 budget this week, it is already 6 months late.

All of which is to say, this majority has done nothing. My Republican colleagues have squandered their majority. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have squandered the country's time and taxpayer dollars and have nothing to show for it.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation in this rule, if enacted, would be disastrous for our environment and would set back much of the progress we have made to tackle the climate crisis.

Legislation in this rule would make it easier for companies to pollute our water. These bills roll back important Clean Water Act provisions that prevent companies from dumping waste and harmful chemicals into our public waterways.

This rule would also make it easier for oil and gas companies to avoid responsibility for cleaning up drilling sites after finishing production. The rule would block efforts by the Biden administration to make Big Oil companies pay their fair share to remediate the environmental damage they have caused.

The rule would cut billions of dollars in funding to help communities like mine mitigate the harmful effects of air pollution. Time and again, we see that the Republican energy agenda means putting polluters and their profits over regular people.

Bills like this make my colleagues wonder just who exactly House Republicans represent. The vast majority of Americans support making energy and mining companies financially responsible for site cleanup. The vast majority of Americans want clean air and clean water. They want to protect their health, and they want their kids to have a healthy future.

Yet, these partisan Republican policies would mean more pollution in our communities so that Exxon and Chevron can boost their stock prices. That doesn't seem like a fair trade for the American people. We need to solve the climate crisis, not enable it. We need to put people over profits and polluters.

Congressional Democrats and President Biden are united behind that goal. In stark contrast to our Republican colleagues, Democrats have passed landmark legislation to combat the climate crisis, grow domestic energy production, and bring our energy infrastructure into the 21st century.

Democrats passed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Infla-

tion Reduction Act. Combined, these bills used tax credits, lending programs, and public-private partnerships to invest billions of dollars in electric vehicles, renewables, energy production, and improvements to the electric grid.

This investment is growing our economy, creating good-paying jobs in green manufacturing, and helping to lay the foundation for the mass adoption of renewable energy sources. Already, the Inflation Reduction Act has created over 170,000 jobs, and it is projected to create more than 1.5 million jobs over the next 10 years.

The Inflation Reduction Act puts America on pace to cut our carbon emissions by 50 percent by 2030 so that we can meet our obligations under the Paris Agreement. The Inflation Reduction Act also caps abandoned oil wells, cleans up Superfund sites, and provides funding to communities to mitigate the effects of industrial pollution.

In the long run, the Inflation Reduction Act and the infrastructure bill will save American families up to \$38 billion on electricity bills, reduce industrial and manufacturing emissions, double the share of American electricity generated by renewables, and accelerate the adoption of electric vehicles.

That is what a real energy agenda looks like. It is not grandstanding, and it is not handouts to oil and gas companies.

The Democrats' energy initiatives and agenda have been wildly successful. Right now, the United States is the number one energy producer in the world. We produce more energy from both renewables and fossil fuels than any other country. This is directly translated into lower energy prices for Americans, more jobs, and higher economic growth, and it has allowed us to provide natural gas to our allies in Europe who have been squeezed by a beligerent Russia.

Under President Biden's leadership, the United States is more energy independent today than at any time in our history. This is an amazing achievement and one that should be celebrated by this Chamber.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear my colleague talk about all the wonderful things that Democrats have done for the oil and gas industry, but it is shocking because Democrats want to ban fracking. Don't believe me. Take their word for it.

Here is KAMALA HARRIS: "There is no question I am in favor of banning fracking."

Here is BERNIE SANDERS: "The only safe and sane way to move forward is to ban fracking nationwide." He then literally introduced a bill banning fracking shortly after that comment.

There is also Pete Buttigieg. He said: "I favor a ban on new fracking and a rapid end to existing fracking."

Finally, here is Biden's Department of the Interior Secretary Deb Haaland:

"I am wholeheartedly against fracking and drilling on public lands."

Those are some of the most influential Democrats in the country, and their goal is simple. They want to ban fracking.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY), my good friend.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHANTHALER), my colleague on the Rules Committee, for yielding me the time.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim, this legislation before us today is about building a cleaner, more secure, more affordable energy future, where the United States is not dependent on foreign countries for its energy needs.

Let me be perfectly clear. The greatest beneficiary of the Biden administration's regulatory onslaught on our Nation's energy sector is China, the Communist country of China. The ones who will pay the biggest cost for President Biden and the left's asinine energy policies are the American people.

The climate agenda that the left is pushing onto this country through the Biden administration and through Democrats in my own State of New York will leave the American people poorer, less secure, and with fewer opportunities, full stop.

Who benefits the most from this administration's new rules on mineral leasing that make it more difficult for the United States to produce its energy and resource needs domestically? China, our biggest adversary and a country that cares little for the environmental health of our world.

When my Democratic colleagues claim that this legislation before us today will somehow loosen protections on our environment and keep our country away from reaching some arbitrary goals set by this administration, don't be fooled.

If this administration or the radical left actually cared about our global environment, my Democratic colleagues wouldn't be putting up roadblocks to safer, cleaner domestic energy production as Democrats are doing with the Bureau of Land Management's newest rules on mineral leasing.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle wouldn't be banning safe, job-creating hydraulic fracturing to produce cleaner, reliable natural gas as New York State Democrats have done, robbing communities across my district of incredible economic opportunities.

The left wouldn't be pushing Americans toward a battery-powered future while making it nearly impossible for our country to produce these very batteries, down to refining the rare earth minerals, domestically.

Democrats in Washington, Albany, and elsewhere, despite their talk of a cleaner future, are leaving us more dependent on foreign countries, including our biggest adversary, China, which

has no qualms about pumping buckets of pollution into the air.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, energy future supported by my colleagues across the aisle is hypocritical, impossibly expensive for everyday Americans, and leaves this country at the mercy of foreign imports to satisfy our energy needs.

I strongly support this underlying legislation before us today because it will turn the ship around and ensure that our energy future is about economic opportunities, domestic security, and affordability for everyday Americans rather than satisfying the radical demands of a woke mob.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair encourages all Members, if you are going to have conversations with staff, please take them off the floor. It is getting a little disruptive.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, we keep being presented by a false choice here—a choice between being environmentally responsible and having economic opportunity, and that is just not true. We can do both.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from nearly 50 organizations in opposition to H.R. 7023.

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

There was no objection.

MARCH 18, 2024.

Re: Oppose H.R. 7023, an attack on our clean water protections

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our members and supporters, the undersigned organizations urge you to oppose H.R. 7023, the misleadingly named "Creating Confidence in Clean Water Permitting Act." [This bill contains several misguided attacks on clean water and the Clean Water Act, puts polluter profits ahead of public health, and would jeopardize the waters that our families, communities, and wildlife depend on.]

Numerous provisions of H.R. 7023 shield industrial dischargers that would pollute or destroy our streams, lakes, wetlands, and other waters from responsibility, thereby imposing on downstream communities the burden of increased pollution and flooding, to say nothing of the costs of remedying those threats. In particular:

Section 2 would give polluters new ways to slow down the Environmental Protection Agency's process for updating water quality criteria. Criteria reflect EPA's assessment of the scientific evidence about how pollutants in our waterways adversely affect human health and aquatic life, and include non-binding recommendations for water quality standards that states can adopt to prevent those harmful effects. By subjecting EPA's issuance of criteria to additional administrative processes and opening them up to industry lawsuits, this bill could delay improved protections reflective of scientific developments—which is particularly concerning for emerging contaminants.

Section 3 would authorize EPA to issue "general" permits under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program for industrial and municipal polluters. This new authority lacks safeguards that Congress included in the parallel general permitting program for "dredge and fill" activities, namely that the activities must have minimal adverse environmental im-

pacts. It also would greatly limit EPA's ability to terminate such a permit if the agency determined it was causing unacceptable harm to the environment.

Section 4 would make it easier for industrial operations to dump PFAS, also known as "forever chemicals," and other emerging contaminants into the nation's waters without accountability. Specifically, the bill would shield dischargers from Clean Water Act liability even if they are aware of certain pollutants in their waste streams but do not disclose it to pollution control officials who do not have reason to expect such contaminants.

Section 5 would virtually eliminate EPA's ability to stop mammoth polluting projects like the Pebble Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed. This rarely-used authority (invoked only 14 times in the Act's history) is crucial to prevent the most egregious projects from destroying precious fisheries, drinking water supplies, and other resources.

Section 6 would require the Army Corps of Engineers to permanently retain a fast-track permit for highly destructive and polluting oil and gas pipelines and greatly weaken the Corps' nationwide permitting program—a program that is already far too lax in preventing and mitigating the harm caused by projects that fill in the nation's waters. The bill would double the duration of general permits, such that advancements in best practices for the dozens of activities covered by such permits would not be required promptly. And it would excuse the Army Corps of Engineers from considering the full environmental consequences of permitted activities, as well as the effects of such activities on endangered species.

Section 7 would prevent effective judicial review of projects that fill in and destroy wetlands, streams, and other waters. The bill would impose an impractically short statute of limitations on court review of "dredge and fill" permits, which would likely force concerned citizens to file suit on more permits in order to preserve their rights, in many instances before the impacts of the permitted project are fully understood. The bill would also severely hamstring courts' authority to provide a remedy for illegal permits because permits found unlawful would ordinarily remain in effect and allow continued harm to water resources while the Army Corps of Engineers reexamines them.

In contrast to these provisions, polling continues to show that people actually want stronger federal protections for our nation's waters. Too many communities, especially Indigenous communities, communities of color, and low wealth communities, still lack clean water. Congress should be focused on putting people before polluters and working to ensure everyone, no matter their race, zip code, or income, has access to clean water, rather than attempting to undermine our critical clean water protections.

Again, we urge you to VOTE NO on H.R. 7023, an attack on our clean water safeguards that would endanger the waters our families and communities depend on and work against the Clean Water Act's objective "to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters."

Sincerely,

Alabama Rivers Alliance; Alliance for the Great Lakes; American Rivers; Amigos Bravos; Appalachian Trail Conservancy; Bayou City Waterkeeper; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Food Safety; Children's Environmental Health Network; Clean Water Action; Clean Wisconsin; Committee on the Middle Fork Vermilion River; Community Water Center.

Earthjustice; Environmental Justice Health Alliance; Environment America; Environmental Law & Policy Center; Environmental Protection Network; Food & Water

Watch; For Love of Water (FLOW); Freshwater Future; GreenLatinos; Izaak Walton League of America; Kentucky Waterways Alliance; Latino Farmers & Ranchers International, Inc.

Lawyers for Good Government; League of Conservation Voters; Maryland Pesticide Education Network; Massachusetts Pollinator Network; Massachusetts Rivers Alliance; Mississippi River Collaborative; National Audubon Society; National Wildlife Federation; Natural Resources Defense Council; New Mexico Wild; Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides; Ohio River Foundation.

People and Pollinators Action Network; PolicyLink; River Network; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center; Surfrider Foundation; The Water Collaborative of Greater New Orleans; Toxic Free North Carolina; Waterkeeper Alliance; Waterkeepers Chesapeake; WE ACT for Environmental Justice; We the People of Detroit.

Ms. SCANLON. They write, "This bill contains several misguided attacks on clean water and the Clean Water Act, puts polluter profits ahead of public health, and would jeopardize the waters that our families, communities, and wildlife depend on."

H.R. 7023 is clearly not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 50 conservation, climate, and public lands organizations strongly opposing H.R. 6009.

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

There was no objection.

MARCH 19, 2024.

SPEAKER JOHNSON, LEADER JEFFRIES, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the undersigned conservation, climate, and public lands organizations, we write today in strong opposition to H.R. 6009, the Restoring American Energy Dominance Act. This legislation circumvents and undermines the administrative process, ignores significant public input across the West, and halts a long overdue update to the federal onshore oil and gas leasing program that protects taxpayers, public lands and the wildlife and communities who rely on them. More importantly, it would prevent Interior from undertaking any substantially similar rule, effectively prohibiting the agency from doing its job to oversee the federal leasing program. We therefore urge all members of the House of Representatives to vote no on this harmful legislation.

The Bureau of Land Management's proposed Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Rule updates federal regulations to implement oil and gas program fiscal reforms enacted via the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). These reforms included increasing the royalty rate for producing oil and gas on federal public lands, realigning rents and fees to account for decades of inflation, and reducing speculation by ending non-competitive leasing and implementing a new nomination fee.

Beyond the IRA, the proposed rule includes a host of other long-overdue protections, including language to penalize routine abusers; preference criteria to steer leasing decisions away from critical habitat, cultural resources, and reduce speculation; and urgent bonding reforms that help ensure that oil and gas operators—rather than taxpayers and surrounding communities—bear the cost of cleaning up drilling sites after production ends.

The reforms in the IRA and this proposed rule—taken together—implement the baseline recommendations outlined by the De-

partment of the Interior, address dire shortcomings in the oil and gas bonding system identified by the Government Accountability Office and other nonpartisan watchdogs over many years, and ensure taxpayers are not subsidizing the oil industry and then paying to clean up drilling sites.

H.R. 6009 would require BLM to withdraw its proposed rule, scuttling many of these important fiscal reforms to protect taxpayers and complicating implementation of duly enacted statutes.

Moreover, the draft legislation runs contrary to the will of the general public. During the rule's 60-day comment period, over 260,000 Americans submitted public comments for the record—over 99 percent of which were supportive of the rule.

Lastly, prohibiting the BLM from moving forward a substantially similar rule is a legislative poison pill. If enacted, it would preclude the agency from administering the federal onshore oil and gas program in the public interest and acknowledging challenges like climate change, extinction, and the clean energy transition—instead requiring that it maintain a broken status quo that favors special interest profits.

For these reasons, we oppose H.R. 6009, and we urge all members of the House of Representatives to vote no on passage.

Sincerely,

Accountable.US; Archaeology Southwest; Citizens for Clean Air, Grand Junction, CO; Climate Action Campaign; Climate Law & Policy Project; Coalition to Protect America's National Parks; Colorado Fiscal Institute; Colorado Wildlands Project; Colorado Wildlife Federation; Conservation Colorado; Conservation Lands Foundation; Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship; Dakota Resource Council; Eagle Summit Wilderness Alliance; Earthjustice; Earthworks; EcoFlight; Endangered Species Coalition; Environmental Defense Fund.

Friends of the Earth US; Great Old Broads for Wilderness—Grand Junction Area Chapter; Great Old Broads for Wilderness—Northwest Colorado Chapter; Great Old Broads for Wilderness; HECHO; Interfaith Power & Light; League of Conservation Voters; Los Pedros ForestWatch; Montana Wildlife Federation; National Parks Conservation Association; National Wildlife Federation; Natural Resources Defense Council; Nevada Conservation League; Nevada Wildlife Federation; New Mexico Voices for Children; New Mexico Wildlife Federation; Northern Plains Resource Council.

Nuestra Tierra; Powder River Basin Resource Council; Public Citizen; Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Rocky Mountain Wild; Sheep Mountain Alliance; Sierra Club; Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance; The Wilderness Society; Town of Nederland, CO; Union of Concerned Scientists; Western Colorado Alliance; Western Organization of Resource Councils; Western Slope Conservation Center; West Virginia Rivers Coalition; Wild Montana; Wilderness Workshop; Wyoming Outdoor Council.

Ms. SCANLON. This letter reads, in part, "This legislation circumvents and undermines the administrative process, ignores significant public input across the West, and halts a long-overdue update to the Federal onshore oil and gas leasing program that protects taxpayers, public lands, and the wildlife and communities who rely on them."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the National Parks Conservation Association strongly opposing H.R. 6009.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, December 6, 2023.

Re NPCA Position on Legislation before the Committee on Natural Resources.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Since 1919, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System. On behalf of our 1.6 million members and supporters nationwide, I write to share NPCA's thoughts on select legislation ahead of a markup in the Committee on Natural Resources scheduled for December 6, 2023.

H.R. 6009—Restoring American Energy Dominance Act: NPCA opposes this legislation, which stops the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) from updating its onshore oil and gas program for the first time in 35 years. Not only does this legislation halt a public regulatory process partway through, it prohibits BLM from proposing any substantially similar rules. This effectively prohibits BLM from updating this program in the future, making it harder for the agency to oversee the federal onshore leasing program.

The proposed rule has been in the works for years. It follows recommendations by the Government Accountability Office and implements reforms already passed into law. In the rule, BLM makes the leasing process more straightforward and streamlines paperwork and filing requirements for industry, making the leasing and auctions processes more consistent and updated for the 21st century. The proposed rule also ensures that BLM considers proximity to national parks and other special places during the parcel selection process. By taking a holistic approach to parcel selection, BLM can avoid conflicts later in the leasing process and costly and time-consuming lawsuits while protecting irreplaceable cultural and natural treasures. This approach also ensures that lands used for conservation and recreation purposes by millions of Americans are not impeded by oil and gas development.

BLM's proposed rule goes a long way towards protecting national parks and their connected landscapes from oil and gas development. NPCA supports the proposed rule's common-sense reforms and believes BLM should be allowed to complete the regulatory process. During the comment period for the proposed rule, over 99% of all comments were supportive. [The current leasing system and onshore oil and gas program is antiquated and does not offer proper oversight or ensure protections and fair returns to American taxpayers. Passing this legislation would leave BLM unable to properly oversee this program and could cause unnecessary harm to our special places.]

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINA HAZARD,  
Legislative Director, National Parks  
Conservation Association.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, this letter reads, in part, "The current leasing system and onshore oil and gas program is antiquated and does not offer proper oversight or ensure protections and fair returns to American taxpayers. Passing this legislation would leave BLM unable to properly oversee this program and could cause unnecessary harm to our special places."

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a Forbes article

entitled: "U.S. Energy Independence Soars to Highest Level in Over 70 Years."

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

There was no objection.

[From Forbes, May 2, 2023]

U.S. ENERGY INDEPENDENCE SOARS TO  
HIGHEST LEVEL IN OVER 70 YEARS

(By Robert Rapier, Senior Contributor)

The topic of U.S. energy independence often sparks debate, with many believing that the country achieved this status under President Trump and lost it during President Biden's tenure.

I have addressed these beliefs previously using data from the Energy Information Administration (EIA). However, recent data from the EIA provides a clearer picture of the situation in 2022.

Before delving into the topic of energy independence, it's important to establish a common definition. There are two ways to think about energy independence. One definition is that we produce more energy than we consume. Based on that definition, even if we import some energy, the fact that we produce more than enough to satisfy our needs would mean the U.S. is energy independent.

If we produce more than we need, why would we import energy? There are a couple of reasons.

One is that the type of energy we import (e.g., crude oil) is a better fit for our energy systems than the energy we produce ourselves. For example, U.S. refineries are well-suited to process heavy, sour crude oils. But the oil produced from the shale oil boom is primarily lighter and sweeter. Thus, U.S. oil producers can export this oil, while refiners can import the heavy, sour crude that they prefer.

The second reason is that we may simply import crude oil to process it and export the finished products. In that scenario, we aren't importing oil because we need it, but rather because it is financially lucrative to do so.

This definition of energy independence—producing more than we consume—will be the definition I use here.

But another definition of energy independence is simply that we don't import energy at all.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, it is one thing that the Biden administration's extreme far-left positions on energy hurt the American economy and by extension the American worker and the American family, but the extremism also hurts our allies abroad.

President Biden has clearly weakened our position on the international stage. Shortly after canceling our own Keystone XL pipeline, which, by the way, crushed tens of thousands of union jobs, the Biden administration greenlit Nord Stream 2.

Before the 2022 midterm elections, the Biden administration released roughly 180 million barrels from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, or roughly 40 percent of that Reserve, that included at least 2 million barrels from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to—are you ready for it?—China.

After pausing new LNG export approvals, the President then waived

sanctions on Iranian energy imports into Iraq. I will talk about that momentarily, though.

It is clear from the administration's actions for these far-left extreme positions that President Biden favors Chairman Xi, Vladimir Putin, and the Ayatollah over the American worker.

Now, let's go back and talk about the Iraq-Iran waiver. After pausing the new LNG export approvals, the Biden administration waived sanctions on Iranian energy imports into Iraq. This unlocks \$10 billion in frozen funds for the Iranian Government who helped fund the October 7 terrorist attack on our number one ally in the world, Israel.

It is clear to me that the White House's energy platform is the following: Yes to our enemies, no to America.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit difficult to believe these crocodile tears for our allies when the House Republicans are holding up the National Security Supplemental, which passed weeks ago in the Senate by a 70-30 vote, it is broadly bipartisan legislation that our allies deserve an up-or-down vote on, and we should see that on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to energy, House Republicans are also presenting us with a false choice. They would have us believe that renewable energy and energy independence are at odds. They want us to think that sustainability and a strong economy are a tradeoff. It is simply not true, and we cannot afford to make this false choice.

As we have seen with the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Inflation Reduction Act, we can have it both ways. We can lower emissions while creating jobs and growing the economy. We can make the transition to solar and wind without displacing businesses or workers.

The Inflation Reduction Act and the infrastructure bill demonstrate that not only does a green transition come hand in hand with economic growth, but also that that growth can be spurred from the middle out and the bottom up.

All over the country, new manufacturing facilities for batteries, solar panels, wind turbines, and electric vehicles are being built. These factories are offering long-term, good-paying jobs that will drive economic development for years to come. It is an American manufacturing renaissance that has been made possible by legislation passed by Democrats and President Biden.

It is a testament to what is possible when legislators roll up their sleeves and solve problems as opposed to playing to their most extreme Members. That is what real leadership looks like.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the

rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, today, the EPA released their tailpipe rule, which is a de facto ban on gas-powered vehicles.

President Biden is setting performance standards for tailpipe emissions that automakers can only meet by producing EVs. This will do serious damage to the American family and the American worker.

Through a series of rules, the Biden administration is eliminating gas-powered vehicles in less than 10 years. For example, the EPA is set to approve California's outright ban on the sale of new internal combustion engine vehicles by 2035.

Additionally, the Department of Transportation is proposing CAFE standards that force fleets to switch to EVs.

What does this mean?

For all the talk about building the middle class, this is an attack, a direct attack, on the middle class. Your average EV driver is making well over six figures a year.

Middle-class Americans will struggle to be able to purchase a family car that can't travel long distances, has limited access to reliable fuel sources, and has components that are predominantly sourced from China.

So there are the Democrats' priorities: harming the middle class while benefiting China.

Also, if you think that it is cute to talk about so-called reliable energy sources, do some research and look at the power grid in Texas. Tell me how well that worked out.

But under President Donald Trump's leadership as opposed to Joe Biden's extreme far-left leadership and agenda, under President Trump's leadership, our Nation actually became energy independent. This was thanks to the progrowth, projob, pro-American energy policies that facilitated an energy renaissance and lowered energy costs for hardworking American families.

Just in my home State of Pennsylvania, we are second in the Nation for natural gas production. The industry supports hundreds of thousands of jobs in the Commonwealth, including roughly 130,000 union jobs that the Democrats falsely claim to care about.

Our Commonwealth has such an abundance of natural resources that we lead the Nation in electricity exports to other States.

Last year, Pennsylvania's impact fee revenue reached an historic level at \$278.9 million, which helps to alleviate tax burdens on our local communities.

When the Biden administration bends the knee to the climate change mob by stopping new LNG export approvals, by taxing natural gas production, by proposing bans on fracking, and placing a de facto ban on gas-powered vehicles, what are they doing?

These actions are hurting American families and American workers, and



local communities are being harmed in States like Pennsylvania.

That is why we must pass this underlying legislation, which will strengthen our position on the international stage and when the final votes are tallied this week, you are going to see on display the stark difference between Democrats and Republicans.

If you stand with the American worker, the American family, and the American job creator, vote “yes” on the rule and the underlying legislation.

If you support energy resources from Chairman Xi, Vladimir Putin, and the Ayatollah, then vote “no” on the rule and “no” on the underlying legislation.

The choice couldn’t be any clearer, and you will see the stark difference between the Democrats and the Republicans on this vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the previous question and “yes” on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. 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 question are postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEIL) at 1 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1085;

Adoption of House Resolution 1085, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 7520, as amended.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1023, REPEALING OF GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION FUND; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1121, PROTECTING AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6009, RESTORING AMERICAN ENERGY DOMINANCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 86, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT A CARBON TAX WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 987, DENOUNCING THE HARMFUL, ANTI-AMERICAN ENERGY POLICIES OF THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7023, CREATING CONFIDENCE IN CLEAN WATER PERMITTING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1085) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1023) to repeal section 134 of the Clean Air Act, relating to the greenhouse gas reduction fund; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1121) to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6009) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw the proposed rule relating to fluid mineral leases and leasing process, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 86) expressing the sense of Congress that a carbon tax would be detrimental to the United States economy; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 987) denouncing the harmful, anti-American energy policies of the Biden administration, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7023) to amend section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to codify certain regulatory provisions relating to nationwide permits for dredged or fill material, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 192, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—207

Aderholt	Barr	Buchanan
Alford	Bean (FL)	Buck
Allen	Bentz	Bucshon
Amodei	Bergman	Burchett
Armstrong	Bice	Burgess
Arrington	Biggs	Burlison
Babin	Billirakis	Calvert
Bacon	Bishop (NC)	Carey
Baird	Boebert	Carl
Balderson	Bost	Carter (GA)
Banks	Brecheen	Carter (TX)

Chavez-DeRemer	Hern	Norman
Ciscomani	Hill	Nunn (IA)
Cline	Hinson	Oberholte
Cloud	Houchin	Ogles
Clyde	Hudson	Owens
Cole	Huizenga	Palmer
Collins	Hunt	Pence
Comer	Issa	Perry
Crane	Jackson (TX)	Pfluger
Crawford	James	Posey
Crenshaw	Johnson (LA)	Reschenthaler
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
D’Esposito	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Davidson	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
De La Cruz	Kean (NJ)	Rose
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Rosendale
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Donalds	Kiley	Roy
Duarte	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Duncan	Kustoff	Salazar
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Scalise
Edwards	LaLota	Schweikert
Ellzey	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Lamborn	Self
Estes	Langworthy	Sessions
Ezell	Latta	Smith (MO)
Feenstra	LaTurner	Smith (NE)
Ferguson	Lawler	Smith (NJ)
Finstad	Lee (FL)	Smucker
Fischbach	Lesko	Spartz
Fitzgerald	Letlow	Staubert
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Steel
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Flood	Luna	Steil
Foxx	Luttrell	Steube
Franklin, Scott	Mace	Strong
Fry	Malliotakis	Tenney
Fulcher	Maloy	Thompson (PA)
Gaetz	Mann	Tiffany
Gallagher	Massie	Timmons
Garbarino	McCaul	Turner
Garcia, Mike	McClain	Valadao
Gimenez	McClintock	Van Drew
Gonzales, Tony	McCormick	Van Dwyne
Good (VA)	McHenry	Van Orden
Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Wagner
Granger	Miller (IL)	Walberg
Graves (LA)	Miller (OH)	Waltz
Graves (MO)	Miller (WV)	Weber (TX)
Green (TN)	Miller-Meeks	Webster (FL)
Greene (GA)	Mills	Wenstrup
Griffith	Moolenaar	Westerman
Grothman	Mooney	Williams (NY)
Guest	Moore (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Guthrie	Moore (UT)	Wittman
Hageman	Moran	Womack
Harris	Murphy	Yakym
Harshbarger	Newhouse	Zinke

## NAYS—192

Adams	Courtney	Ivey
Aguilar	Craig	Jackson (IL)
Allred	Crockett	Jackson (NC)
Amo	Crow	Jackson Lee
Auchincloss	Davids (KS)	Jacobs
Barragan	Davis (NC)	Jayapal
Beatty	Dean (PA)	Jeffries
Bera	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Beyer	DeLauro	Kamlager-Dove
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Deluzio	Keating
Blunt Rochester	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	Dingell	Khanna
Bowman	Doggett	Kilmer
Boyle (PA)	Escobar	Kim (NJ)
Brown	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Budzinski	Espallat	Kuster
Bush	Evans	Landsman
Caraveo	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Carbajal	Foushee	Larson (CT)
Cárdenas	Frost	Lee (NV)
Carson	Galleo	Lee (PA)
Carter (LA)	Garamendi	Leger Fernandez
Cartwright	Garcia (IL)	Levin
Casar	Garcia (TX)	Lieu
Case	Garcia, Robert	Lofgren
Casten	Goldman (NY)	Lynch
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Magaziner
Castro (TX)	Gonzalez,	Manning
Cherfilus-	Vicente	Matsui
McCormick	Gottheimer	McBath
Chu	Green, Al (TX)	McClellan
Clark (MA)	Hayes	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Himes	McGarvey
Cleaver	Horsford	McGovern
Cohen	Houlihan	Menendez
Connolly	Hoyer	Meng
Correa	Hoyle (OR)	Mfume
Costa	Huffman	Moore (WI)