

Mr. Speaker, hunters and anglers are the backbone of American wildlife conservation efforts and are invested in the long-term health of wildlife.

It is important that Congress comes to their defense against ideologically driven and unscientific decisions that limit access to our public lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the big bad government was really basing their actions on science, why did they randomly pick seven wildlife refuges? Why didn't they propose this across the Nation?

Again, this is a classic sue and settle. They got sued by their friends in the radical environmental groups, and they decided to settle and give them a little consolation prize of a few wildlife refuges, thinking we might just turn our backs and say it was just a few refuges. They are just giving a little gift to their friends in the radical environmental movement. Let's go on and work on something else, but you have to stop these actions where they start.

To be clear, this bill doesn't prevent the Federal Government from banning the use of lead ammunition and tackle, but it does say that any ban must be supported by site-specific science showing that the use of lead is harming wildlife in that refuge.

It also requires that States be properly consulted when the Federal Government proposes to ban the use of lead. If some of my colleagues have an issue with that, they must ask themselves if they consider States to be partners in conserving wildlife or stakeholders who they can ignore.

I believe that a true partnership between States and Federal Government and wildlife conservation is the best path forward, and this bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WITTMAN for his leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Dingell of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 615 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. DINGELL is as follows:

Mrs. Dingell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 615 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

#### SEC. 3. DETERMINATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 2 may not take effect until the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, jointly determine, in consultation with Indian Tribes, in coordination with State wildlife agencies, and informed by the Hunting and Wildlife Conservation Council, that the implementation of such section will not result in a decrease in public lands made available for hunting and fishing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. 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.

□ 1530

#### WESTERN ECONOMIC SECURITY TODAY ACT OF 2023

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 3397) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-32 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3397

*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 "Western Economic Security Today Act of 2024" or the "WEST Act of 2024".*

#### SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF BLM RULE.

*The final rule based on the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Conservation and Landscape Health" (88 Fed. Reg. 19583 (April 3, 2023)) shall have no force or effect.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3397.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Representative CURTIS' bill, H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act, or WEST Act of 2024.

The WEST Act withdraws the flawed and illegal Conservation and Landscape Health Rule, which was finalized earlier this month by the Bureau of Land Management, or the BLM.

You may be asking, why is a rule focused on conservation and landscape health so bad. Well, it wouldn't be bad if that was what it was really focused on, but the name is very misleading.

This rule is a poorly concealed effort to lock up more lands to advance the Biden administration's radical 30x30 agenda. It has absolutely nothing to do with true conservation or improving the health of our landscapes.

Responsible uses of BLM lands are central to the Western way of life. This rule would fundamentally upend more than 50 years of land management practices across the West that rural communities have relied on for their livelihoods.

Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, or FLPMA, the BLM is mandated to manage lands in accordance with multiple use and sustained yield. If responsible use and development of public lands are prohibited, family and small businesses, multi-generation ranches, local communities, and schools will suffer from a lack of economic development, access, and tax revenue.

This is more than just a Western issue. If you ate a hamburger this week or filled your car with gas, this rule affects you. This rule will severely impact the lives and wallets of every single American. Haven't we had enough of that already? Haven't we had enough of inflation and rising prices?

The finalized rule will broadly allow the BLM to lease lands under new and vaguely defined "restoration and mitigation leases" and change standards around land use decisions. The rule will elevate conservation as a use of our public lands. This is clearly contradictory with both the plain reading of FLPMA and Congress' intent.

Congress very clearly defined the principal or major uses of BLM lands to "include, and be limited to, domestic livestock grazing, fish and wildlife development and utilization, mineral exploration and production, rights-of-way, outdoor recreation, and timber

production.” Nowhere in the act do the words “conservation,” “restoration,” or “mitigation” appear as a use.

Conservation is not a use. It is a value and an outcome that can be generated by the uses that I just mentioned.

If the administration determines that uses such as grazing, timber production, energy production, mining, or recreation are incompatible with the lease, they would not be allowed and could be prohibited indefinitely from those lands.

At best, the rule is duplicative, unnecessary, and burdensome. Meaningful conservation work is already being done on the 245 million acres of BLM land with multiple stakeholders. Often uses overlap on BLM land and coexist with each other. Meaningful conservation occurs simultaneously with and often for the mutual benefit of other uses, like grazing and recreation.

At worst, restoration and mitigation leases are a guise to restrict any meaningful activity on Federal land, including energy and mineral production, and timber management.

The final rule allows the BLM to issue mitigation leases indefinitely and waives fees on restoration leases. That would take land that could otherwise be creating a return for the American taxpayer and give it away for free to environmental extremists.

What will this rule look like on the ground and mean for Westerners? Specifically, the Biden administration can kick off the multigenerational rancher who has been grazing on the land since before the Bureau of Land Management existed. They can restrict the mining of the minerals we need for phones, computers, cars, and batteries to sustain life. They can limit oil and gas development, creating dependence on hostile foreign nations and threatening our economic prosperity.

In addition to this new convoluted leasing system, the rule would also expedite the designation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by removing public comment periods and allowing the BLM to “temporarily” restrict land use without public input. This provides the BLM with virtually unlimited authority to lock up millions of acres without any input from the public or support.

The rule sorely favors types of energy development the administration likes and hurts other responsible energy development they have deemed unworthy.

The rule chooses winners and losers. Wealthy elites who want to protect views from their mansions or extreme environmental groups who want to kick locals off of public lands are the winners.

Guides and outfitters who bring young and old alike to our public lands or the ranching family who works every day to put food on millions of American tables are the losers.

In finalizing this rule, the Biden administration has jeopardized the ac-

tivities and land used to feed and fuel our country. Make no mistake: This affects every American. This impacts every acre, every user, every lease, and every American.

The finalized rule comes after a year-long effort by Western Governors, communities, stakeholders, and Members of Congress calling for the abandonment of this flawed rule. The concerns fell on deaf ears within the Biden administration. This prompted us to bring this bill to the floor this week, forcing the withdrawal of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Representative CURTIS for his work on the bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3397, the WEST Act of 2024. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, the so-called WEST Act.

I have great respect for the chairman and the Member who has authored this particular piece of legislation, but we strongly disagree about this particular bill, and I want to tell you why.

First and foremost, just by way of context, we have been on the House floor all day today, the better part of a few hours, debating proposals that the majority has submitted that would roll back environmental protections.

House Republicans want to remove protections for pristine Boundary Waters watershed in Minnesota. They want to eliminate protections for endangered species. As we heard during the last debate, apparently now they want to increase the use of poisonous lead ammunition. This is not what this august body should be spending its time focused on.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3397 is just more of the same. Now, I heard during the presentation by my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle reference to hamburgers, the cost of gasoline, and mansions, I believe, none of which have anything to do with this particular bill, Mr. Speaker.

I want to try to explain to the American people what this bill is all about. The Biden administration, in short, has taken steps to enhance public land stewardship. House Republicans are standing in the way.

What do I mean by that? Two weeks ago, on April 18, the Biden administration released the Bureau of Land Management’s Conservation and Landscape Health Final Rule, or what has been referred to as the public lands rule.

The rule is a necessary and long overdue update to the agency’s framework for public lands management. In particular, the rule will protect clean water, clean air, and wildlife habitat. It will promote the restoration of degraded landscapes. It will ensure that decisions are based on the best available science in collaboration with Tribal, local, and rural communities. That, Mr. Speaker, is progress.

Here is what the bill does not do: It does not disallow or preclude any one of the multiple uses that the chairman

referenced during the opening of this particular debate. As my colleagues on the other side have described the rule, I think I heard the word duplicative. The rule is either duplicative or, in the view of the majority, as they have said, it ends all uses of all land in all of the country. It can’t be both.

Clearly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take issue with this particular rule and its protection of wildlife and its inclusion of conservation. I understand that disagreement, but the American people do not agree with that position.

The Bureau of Land Management, or BLM, just by way of background, manages more than 245 million acres of Federal public land, which is roughly one-tenth of America’s land base. In my home State of Colorado, the BLM manages more than 8.3 million acres of land.

Many of those acres are near my district; just by way of example, the Yampa Valley Trail in Moffat County.

This includes, by the way, national conservation lands, a collection of revered, treasured landscapes, recreation destinations, other special places that are managed to protect resources to us as Americans. These lands stretch across the Rocky Mountain West. Our citizens, our constituents, rely on these lands, and that is why this rule is such a critical development.

It is also why this rule is so popular. Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of the comments received during the extensive public comment period were positive. Those comments came from local community leaders, outdoor recreation industry, scientists, small businesses, Tribal communities, many others, citizens in my State and States across the West. They want to see our public lands managed in a balanced and sustainable manner that will promote access and resilience, and that is exactly what the Biden administration has achieved with this new rule and why I am proud to support it.

Now, again, I don’t want to belabor this point, but it bears repeating. Despite the claims from my Republican colleagues, the plain language of this rule does not prioritize one use over another. It does not do that. I encourage any American who wishes to learn more to look at the plain language of the rule. It simply puts conservation on equal footing with livestock grazing, mining, and oil and gas development. It doesn’t block or stifle development. It achieves a critical balance, and that balance is important; a reasonable balance, a prudent balance.

I support this rule because it will enable us to make science-based and informed decisions about the management of our Nation’s public lands. I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the rule for the same reason. If they do, I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill, which seeks to undermine those efforts, and to oppose the legislation.

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

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

As I was listening to my friend from Colorado's comments, I was reminded of a saying that a graduate school professor who taught statistics used to say: Numbers and people are a lot alike. If you torture them long enough, they will tell you anything you want to know.

This study that my colleagues talk about references a cherry-picked 10,000 comments that were analyzed, and according to the BLM just over 8,000 were actually unique comments. That means that 2,000 of the comments were identical comments. These are comments that get submitted when you put clickbait out there and say, "Send this comment in," and you just hit the button from your favorite radical environmental group, and it goes into the BLM or to the other Federal agency.

Also, you know, I would expect the results to actually be even higher because it is kind of like asking: "Do you like ice cream?" or "Do you like chocolate?" or "Do you like candy?" When you say, are you for conservation and protecting the land, yeah, most people I think are for that. However, when you look at what this rule does, it is anything but that. It locks up land and takes it away from the multiple uses that Congress has designated that this BLM land is for.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Western Economic Security Today Act of 2023, or the WEST Act.

My bill, as has been discussed, would require the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw their proposal regulating conservation of landscape health.

Utah's farmers and ranchers for generations have worked on this land, leaving it better than they found it. They understand how to live in a way that strengthens the landscape but allows for them to provide for their family and their community. I like to tease them that they are the original environmentalists. They don't always like that term.

Ironically, this rule also undermines the work of these individuals who keep the land in good health and help prevent the risk of wildfires to instead lock the public out of Utah's lands.

Let me be clear: I have immense respect for Utah's local land managers who do their best with the resources they have. I appreciate their commitment to integrating into each unique community and working hard to find consensus. They are not the problem. The problem is Washington politicians who think they know better than the generations of families who actually live in Utah.

The question isn't whether or not we want to protect these lands but who gets to make the decisions.

Since coming to Congress, one of my favorite experiences has been connecting with Utah's rural communities. They give so much and ask for so little. They work hard to feed our families, protect American energy, and lead in manufacturing. We should be making it easier for them.

Instead, the Biden administration is pushing this rule to allow environmental groups funded by Swiss billionaires who pretend to be representing Utahns to lock up public lands. This is completely backward.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two stories about how this foreign dark money is funding environmental groups in Utah.

#### ADVENTURE . . . WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Recently I Googled "Moab" and "adventure" on my computer and came up with 480,000 hits. Apparently there are adventures enough to be found in Moab to keep tourists entertained and spending their money until the next Millennium. Just to mention a handful, I found the Moab Adventure Center, Moab Adventure Xstream, Moab Adventure Headquarters, Moab Adventure Inn, Moab Adventure Package, Moab Adventure Guide, Moab Desert Adventures, Adventure Xscapes, Adventure Racing Retreats, Moab Resort Adventure Package and a link to the Moab Adventure Park, from WWTV Newswatch50 in, of all places, Watertown, New York. They reported the following:

MOAB, Utah—Riding down the ski lift from the highest point on the red-rock rim overlooking the Moab Valley in Utah, our feet dangled some 800 feet in the air as Scott McFarland talked about the latest project for his Moab Adventure Park. "We're applying for permits for a zip-line, a 2,500-foot-long cable that goes from the top of the hill to the bottom," McFarland said. "You get into a harness on the top and cruise to the bottom, kind of like you're flying."

"Without a braking system, you'd hit about 145 miles per hour. With the system, you'll go 50 or 60. That's on the computer, anyway. We'll see." One of the city's concerns in considering the permits is its noise ordinance. Nearby residents are worried about screams coming from riders zipping down the cliff."

Sad to say that's one adventure we'll never have to embrace, thanks to one of my favorite environmental groups, The Nature Conservancy, who bought the tram and removed it from the face of the earth.

By comparison, if you travel just 55 miles south to the sleepy Mormon/cowboy hamlet of Monticello, the "adventure" falls off dramatically, to just 759. What do you expect from a town without a brew pub? I kept searching for an adventure-free town and the best I could hope for was Benkelman, Nebraska that could only muster 154 hits and Gnaw Bone, Indiana with a paltry 64.

At the other end of the adventure scale, nearby Aspen, Colorado kicks Moab's relatively passive as with 1,890,000 adventure hits and New York City, the Gotham of all Thrills, generates an incredible 8,370,000 hits. But if you can believe this, according to Google, you can find four times as many adventures in New York as you can in Baghdad, which produced less than 2 million hits. That is a telling piece of information. Just what kinds of adventures are we talking about?

And what exactly is an "adventure?" According to one internet dictionary, an adventure is "an undertaking or enterprise of a hazardous nature," or "an undertaking of a questionable nature (both sound like Bag-

dad to me as well as certain areas of the Big Apple)."

Or . . . "an unusual or exciting experience."

This is the definition I was looking for. This is the kind of adventure that tourists are in search of when they come to places like Moab. Most if not all of the "Moab Adventure" Google hits are commercial enterprises, anxious and eager to provide an "exciting and unusual experience" for the paying public. Their businesses certainly CAN-NOT be, to even a modest degree, "hazardous in nature." I doubt if any adventure tour company could survive if its owners faced their first customers of the day and announced, "Listen up people . . . we want all of you to understand that there's a real good chance only half of you will survive this hike to the Fiery Furnace . . . the rest of you will probably die in free falls or rock collapses. So call your friends and family now and tell them how much you love 'em."

And forget about experiences of a "questionable nature." Add to the previous warning this addendum: "And don't forget our climbing equipment is as old as my granny and she passed on in 1965, so don't be surprised if that ol' rotten frayed rope we use snaps like a dry twig."

No . . . none of this would pass muster. Instead, the adventure tour companies must endure all kinds of inspections, meet various federal standards, and pay substantial insurance premiums, to insure that the "adventure" is as free of hazards as humanly possible. It's okay for the customer to get excited, and compared to the workaday/cubicle life he or she leaves behind to come on this adventure vacation, how could it be anything but? But is it really an adventure?

I have my own adventure definition—I would call it a "spontaneously sought, poorly planned, even stupidly conceived exploration of a mystery." Spontaneity is critical to an adventure. How can an adventure be planned and scheduled? And a real adventure should have an unknown component to it . . . maybe there will be hazards ahead . . . maybe not. Who knows? It's a Mystery!!

But this is what it's become:

"Now let's see Kimberly . . . I'm thinking . . . an adventure that starts around 10am would be perfect because I want to have a leisurely breakfast at the Jailhouse Café. Love the eggs benedict! Then maybe a rappel somewhere? Or would you rather do a boat thing? No more than \$100 . . . \$150 tops. And back here by four for drinks at McStiff's . . . does that sound perfect or what?"

I know . . . I know! Once again, I'm out of touch with Mainstream Adventure America and how can I argue with 480,000 Google hits and a booming adventure economy? (I think even a couple of my advertisers have "adventure" in there somewhere). But like so many other words—wilderness—for instance, an adventure just isn't what it used to be, or even mean, I'll take my adventures as they come, unplanned, unscheduled, free, and if it kills me, I just hope I don't die with a cell phone clutched in my hand, frantically punching 911 as I hurtle toward the greatest adventure of them all.

DYNAMO JIM STILES

If this doesn't give me some credence as an adventurous type, I don't know what will. Someone told me that the first issue of *The Zephyr* was being auctioned on eBay and while searching for it. I discovered this out-of-print book. This is from the book description:

"James Stiles was a banker and educator. Most notably, he was the publisher of the *Nassau* (County, NY) Post, *Daily Review* and *Review-Star*. His newspapers, and other local work like his stints as director of Roosevelt Raceway and trustee and chairman of

Adelphi College, were key in the growth of this New York City bedroom community.

Strange. Here's the cover.

SUWA, CAN YOU SPARE A DIME?

When I made southeast Utah my home, almost 30 years ago, I came for one reason—I came for the rocks—for the most stunning display of intricately carved, brilliantly hued red rocks imaginable. It's the kind of place one can believe only exists in Dreams. I've lived here ever since.

I was very young when I arrived in Moab and like so many other wide-eyed idealists of the time, viewed the battle to save the canyon country's dwindling wilderness lands in very black and white terms. And with good reason. Then, southeast Utah was still a vast, mostly unpopulated expanse of deserts and mountains, dotted with tiny communities that had changed little in a century, which depended mostly on the extractive industries for survival and which might, at best, get a small boost from tourism during the summer. And so environmentalists devoted their time and energy and resources to fight the threats to wildlands they thought were most persistent and enduring—mining, timber, and cattle.

Naturally I went searching for kindred spirits, those individuals and groups that shared my love for the red rocks, hoping together we could save some of it. Among those Quixotic spirits was the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. When SUWA was created, in the early 1980s, it was a small grass roots organization dedicated to preserving wilderness, with its headquarters in “the heart of the storm,” Boulder, Utah. SUWA's founders were burned in effigy in nearby Escalante, and the group gained a reputation early-on for being the little guys who weren't afraid of a flight.

In the late-80s, under the leadership of Brant Calkin, SUWA expanded its membership base dramatically, made Utah wilderness a national issue and pushed forward with a 5.7 million acres wilderness bill. Brant is almost regarded as a patron saint among environmentalists. A few years ago, Scott Groene, SUWA's current Executive Director wrote, “Brant Calkin is the best damn environmentalist that ever worked on the Colorado Plateau, and he's done more to protect southern Utah wilderness than anyone alive or dead.” Groene noted Calkin's ascetic approach to environmentalism. “Brant offered his staff low pay but lots of autonomy to ‘do good and fight evil.’ . . . He offered as rationale both that environmentalists have an obligation to spend their members' money wisely . . .” Through it all, Brant did his job, “with a quiet humility, integrity, and basic decency towards both his opponents and friends.”

And he shared the Executive Director's 20,000 a year with the Associate Director until his retirement in 1993.

“Brant never stopped working,” Groene noted, “whether it was leading the Utah Wilderness Coalition out of shaky consensus efforts, hustling money, or fixing a fleet a beater SUWA cars (he was renown for resurrecting aging office equipment and trucks). And when it seemed everything was done, he'd start cleaning the office.”

Brant also believed the key to success was to “build the membership,” and by the mid-90s SUWA was financially secure and its membership had grown nationwide to more than 20,000.

But if it's true that most good deeds go unrewarded, SUWA is a notable exception. In the late-90s SUWA suddenly found itself flush with money. A million dollar grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts and a \$524,000 contribution from the Wyss Foundation put the once struggling Utah wilderness

group into a different financial realm. The Wyss donation was particularly fortuitous. Its founder, Swiss-born Hansjorg Wyss, became a member of SUWA's Board of Directors in 1996 and is its current chairman. Wyss is a multi-billionaire who is the president of Synthes, an international company that manufactures biotech and surgical implants. In 2004, Forbes Global called Wyss the 26th wealthiest person in Europe with almost \$6 billion; by 2005 he rose to 18th place with an accumulated wealth of almost \$8 billion. That's right . . . billion.

Hansjorg Wyss's contributions to SUWA include a \$900,000 building in downtown Salt Lake City and another \$500,000 in renovations. The old three-story home is now SUWA's very comfortably appointed headquarters (memories of Brant fixing aging office equipment almost seem quaint) and contributions from Wyss and others have swelled SUWA's financials. According to its 2004 tax return, SUWA has almost \$5 million in “net assets and fund balances,” including \$2.5 million in “savings and temporary cash investments” and nearly \$300,000 in “non-interest bearing cash (imagine keeping that kind of cash reserve in an account that draws zero interest).” It has mutual funds and stock investments and a Charles Schwab account worth almost \$1 million and another \$1 million in land, buildings and equipment.

With all those assets, plans are now being finalized to hold a gala party in late May as a tribute to Hansjorg Wyss. The event, to be held at a posh hotel in New York City, will cost about \$100,000. But according to SUWA, “it's a fund raising event . . . (it) will raise us money.”

I have to ask How much more money does SUWA need?

No one can fault SUWA for its good fortune but Utah's most prominent environmental organization is starting to look more like a bank. And while its coffers have grown, its membership, according to a SUWA source, has fallen by almost 30 percent to less than 14,000.

Meanwhile, threats to Utah's wildlands are becoming more complicated and more diverse. The explosion of growth in “New West” towns like Moab and St. George, to name just a couple, are creating environmental impacts unheard of 20 years ago. Urban sprawl isn't confined to Salt Lake City anymore. Wildlife habitat in rural parts of Utah is being threatened by residential and commercial development. Nonmotorized recreation and the commercial exploitation of national parks and proposed wilderness areas are affecting a key component of wilderness—solitude. And a proposed dam on the Bear River and a pipeline from Lake Powell to St. George will surely create another thorny bundle of environmental nightmares.

And yet, while SUWA remains Utah's most vigilant watchdog in areas of ORV abuse, oil and gas exploration and public lands grazing, it steadfastly refuses to involve itself in any of these “New West” issues. SUWA insists it is a wilderness organization, with the very specific goal of establishing a 9.3 million acre BLM wilderness bill. It is reluctant to spend a penny on worthy causes that fall outside that self-imposed restriction. “Our top priority,” says Executive Director Groene, “is protecting our wilderness proposal. Until we have protected the lands that qualify as wilderness, the issues outside our boundaries will be lower priorities.” He calls the SUWA surplus its “war chest, for use in emergencies or when extraordinary opportunities arise, and with board approval.” SUWA's rainy day fund.

In case they haven't noticed . . . it's raining buckets.

So, if SUWA isn't willing to become involved in some of these other pressing issues that fall outside the realm of BLM wilderness, perhaps SUWA can part with some of its surplus and give it to organizations that will. Just off the top of my head and without asking any of them if they need extra funding, I can think of several worthy Utah environmental groups: The High Uintahs Preservation Council, the Utah Rivers Council, the Nine Mile Coalition, the Utah Environmental Congress, Save Our Canyons, Friends of the Great Salt Lake and my sentimental favorite, the Glen Canyon Institute. I'm sure this barely scratches the surface of worthy would-be recipients. But all of these organizations are doing good and noble work and when someone with SUWA's assets can lend a hand, why not?

Ultimately aren't we all on the same side? Don't all these groups share a common goal—to improve the quality of Utah's natural resources and to preserve and protect the beauty of a landscape that is dear to us all? Brant Calkin urged SUWA to “spend its money wisely.” What could be wiser and ultimately more satisfying than sharing its largesse where it can accomplish the most?

MOAB CITY COPS . . . LEAVE THE ZEPHYR WEBMASTER ALONE!!!

For the last couple of years, the Zephyr web site has been managed and maintained with skill and reliability by Moabite Gary Henderson. He's also a baker at Red Rock Bakery (and a longtime advertiser) on Main Street.

Three times now in the last couple of months, Gary has been “pulled over” by Moab's finest while riding his BICYCLE to work in the early morning hours.

He was forced to provide ID, though clearly he had done nothing wrong and was even required to explain a “lump in his pocket” that the police thought looked suspicious.

This is nothing new for the Moab Police Department; I personally experienced this kind of harassment (though not quite so direct) a little more than a year ago. And many Moabites have their own stories to tell.

I hope that Chief Navarre and Mayor Dave Sakrison and the City Council will pay a bit more attention to these kinds of incidents. Maybe you guys could table a few subdivision proposals for a while and devote some time to the well being of your constituents . . . it seems to me that's about all the city and county governments ever deal with nowadays.

And leave Gary alone!

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the link to the second story can be found here: <https://www.eenews.net/articles/quietly-philanthropic-tycoon-makes-his-mark-in-the-west/>.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration didn't even pretend to care what rural Utahns thought about this rule. I sent a letter nearly a year ago with my Natural Resources Committee colleagues, asking the agency to hold more public listening sessions on this rule, including a session in Utah. Instead, the agency ignored this request and finalized the rule.

Over 60 percent of Utah's land is federally managed. I have counties with 90 percent, yet no public listening session was held in Utah.

This rule has an oversized impact on our State. That is why the WEST Act must pass today.

We must fight to stop this rule and then immediately repeal it under the

next administration. It is critical that Utah's lands remain under the stewardship of those who have tended it for generations.

There is a lot of hyperbole in Washington, and I am genuine when I say this is one of the most offensive attacks on rural Utah I have seen in my career. I will continue to work tirelessly to repeal this disastrous effort.

My bill, the WEST Act, is pushing against this flawed rule. We should be empowering local communities, not punishing them.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to also respectfully oppose H.R. 3397, or what my colleagues across the aisle are calling the WEST Act.

I, too, have great respect for the chair and for the sponsor of this bill, and especially for the farmers, ranchers, and land stewards who were just referenced, but I vehemently disagree with the premise of what this bill and the underlying rule do and how it was characterized.

This bill would overturn a long-overdue administrative action to protect our public lands, wildlife, and cultural sites and access to the outdoors, with the intent of tipping the scales back to a time when extractive industries—oil and gas companies, multinational mining corporations, and developers—had the upper hand in dictating the uses of our public lands.

Like so many efforts by the GOP this Congress to chip away at our rights, unfortunately, this bill seeks to undermine and strip away the Bureau of Land Management's recently released final public lands rule, which establishes a framework to protect our Nation's public lands and ensure healthy ecosystems, waters, and wildlife, and a historic effort to protect the special places and cultural sites that are so important to our communities, their identities, and who they are, especially for our Tribal communities.

Unlike the disinformation that has been offered up here today, this rule will not stop other productive uses on public lands but will ensure that they are informed by the best-available science, protect our ecosystems, and provide for climate resilience, and it will ensure that we are not developing on sensitive and sacred sites.

In fact, in New Mexico, when we implemented a similar rule on our State lands, not only did it not end resource development but the State saw historic revenues from these activities on State lands while we managed to protect the special places that make us who we are.

I say to my friends out there across the West: Don't buy into the political hype and disinformation. This actually is about protecting our public lands and is what our public lands management is supposed to look like. That is why it was supported by more than 90 percent of the comments that were

submitted. The vast majority of Americans, in fact, over 80 percent across the political spectrum, support protecting public lands.

That is why I strongly stand with the President, Secretary Haaland, and the good people of BLM, who are working every day to preserve our lands, waters, and cultural sites.

Under the same rubric of protecting our public lands and waters, I also stand to oppose H.R. 3195, which would similarly withdraw a Department of the Interior effort to protect 225,000 acres in the Boundary Waters from mineral leasing. This bill would rescind DOI's public land order and would put America's most visited wilderness at risk of sulfide or copper mining by a large multinational corporation based out of South America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, in spite of over a million dollars that this corporation has spent lobbying the U.S. Government, the people have spoken and submitted over 675,000 public comments to protect the Boundary Waters.

That is why I support the protection of this pristine, interconnected watershed, forest ecosystems, and the homelands of the Anishinaabe people who have lived here since time immemorial.

One mining accident could irrevocably destroy these lands and waters forever. New Mexico knows this history all too well, which is why I strongly oppose H.R. 3195 and support the administration's actions in protecting Boundary Waters.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WESTERMAN, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act.

Since day one in office, President Biden has consistently attacked our Western way of life. His administration's latest effort is one of the most egregious examples of Federal overreach against our public lands in decades.

Two weeks ago, the Bureau of Land Management finalized their conservation and landscape health rule in spite of staunch opposition to the proposal. This rule illegally elevates conservation under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act's multiple-use mandate for public lands, contrary to congressional intent, and means that America's lands could be locked up from their intended purposes.

The rule threatens production of America's abundant natural resources, grazing, and recreational access to our

public lands, all for the sake of a political handout to climate alarmists and activists.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I have been fighting against this rule because prosperity in rural Western America is under attack. I am proud to join my friend from Utah in support of this legislation to overturn this rule and protect our Western way of life.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for bringing this important bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act, led by my friend and colleague, Mr. CURTIS.

This bill will stop the latest Biden administration attack on the Western way of life. Last week, I attended a Natural Resources Committee field hearing in Hurricane, Utah, and heard firsthand how destructive the BLM's conservation and landscape health rule will be to communities.

By allowing arbitrary standards and vaguely defined leases to lock up lands from grazing, energy production, and recreation, the BLM is leaving rural America behind and costing our economy billions of dollars in the process.

We are going to hear the back and forth about this particular bill today. What it comes down to is actually listening to the people doing the job. That is what we do out West. We actually do the job that America needs for our energy, for our food. Everything that we live on in our society primarily comes from out West.

For Washington, D.C., bureaucrats to not listen to ranchers that have been grazing and farming that land in Utah for generations is the most offensive thing that can exist in this world of politics, and there is a lot there. This does not make sense. Go listen to somebody who is looking and seeing. They are terrified because there is no trust. There is trust in the balance that we want to talk about because there is always government overreach when we talk about the balance of using Federal lands.

The multiuse is so concerning. They want to be able to graze, keep fire risk low, and grow livestock in a responsible way. They do not trust that the balance trying to be sold on this particular initiative is sincere. I believe them when they say this is bad because I am representing them.

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

Mr. Speaker, look, I have, again, great respect for the chairman and the gentleman from Utah who just spoke, but balance is exactly what we are trying to achieve. As a Representative from the West, I can tell you that my constituents support this rule, as do the vast majority of folks out West.

There have been these repeated references to Washington. I think the phrase was Washington bureaucrats. I don't know about the gentleman from Utah. Perhaps he doesn't have a relationship with the land management in his State. I certainly have a very productive and robust relationship with our BLM partners in Colorado, including the Western headquarters, which is based in Grand Junction, Colorado—one of the reasons, by the way, that one of the comment sessions, the forums hosted by the BLM with respect to the rulemaking on this particular rule, was held in Colorado.

The agency is listening to the folks on the ground, to citizens, to folks in rural America, to folks in the Rocky Mountain West, to hunters and anglers who, by the way, also support this rule.

There have been multiple references to this notion that somehow, by the BLM promulgating this rule, that enables multiple use and does not put one use ahead of another, that that would somehow negatively implicate hunters or anglers—not true.

How do we know it is not true? Because the back-country hunters and anglers sent a letter yesterday to the Speaker of the House. I will read from it:

We strongly urge the House of Representatives to vote “no” on these bills. The bills that they are referencing include, among others, the WEST Act.

In particular, I will again read from their letter, not my words:

H.R. 3397, that is the WEST Act, would prohibit the implementation of the recently finalized BLM public lands rule. Hunters and anglers widely supported this forward-looking, comprehensive rule that will have a meaningful impact on fish and wildlife habitat by prioritizing conservation and restoration alongside other types of land use.

□ 1600

This is a reasonable rule. It is a prudent rule that unfortunately is being threatened by this extreme bill that I don't think the majority of the American people will support.

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

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

This isn't just a minor rule. This is a major rule that the BLM is pushing out.

When they held their listening sessions, they were located in places that were inconvenient for communities and stakeholders who are most affected by the rule to actually participate in.

Only three of the listening sessions held by the BLM were in person, and they were all three in major cities. They were in Albuquerque, Denver, and Reno.

Two of the five listening sessions were held virtually, affecting rural communities who have limited access to the internet.

The BLM refused to hold listening sessions in the following Western States: Alaska, Arizona, California,

Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, and Washington.

You would think if they really cared about what the local stakeholders thought, they would have gone out to them and had listening sessions where people could have participated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife, and Fisheries.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chair WESTERMAN for giving me the opportunity to speak in favor of this important bill.

This bill would reverse a rule that essentially destroys multiple use of Federal lands. However, to put this in perspective, we should call out how much land we are actually talking about.

Looking at the Bureau of Land Management's web page, the Bureau of Land Management administers more surface land, 245 million acres, or one-tenth of America's land base, and more subsurface mineral States, 700 million acres, than any other agency in the United States.

The BLM's mission, which is principally defined by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, FLPMA, directs the agency to carry out a dual mandate, that of managing public land for multiple uses while conserving national, historical, and cultural resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is incredibly important because what the rule does is to prioritize conservation. Contrary to what we have heard repeatedly from the other side of the aisle, there is a prioritization.

Let me read from the rule itself, page 19583 of the Federal Register, which says: “The Bureau of Land Management proposes new regulations that, pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, and other relevant authorities, would advance the BLM's mission to manage the public lands for multiple use and sustained yield ‘by prioritizing the health and resilience of ecosystems across those lands.’”

Now, one could argue, I suppose, that means it just brings it level, but I would suggest it makes it much more important than the other uses. It certainly could be read that way.

The proposed rule provides that the BLM will protect intact landscapes—will protect, doesn't say might—restore degraded habitat, and make wise management decisions based on science and data.

To support these activities, the proposed rule would apply land health standards to all BLM-managed lands and uses and clarify that conservation is a “use”.

Well, what they are trying to do is say it is no higher on the scale than any of the other uses, but in point of fact, in the same paragraph, they suggest and, I think, direct otherwise.

It astounds me that my colleagues from across the aisle—actually, I wrote

down shocks. I think it is a better word—that they would want to increase our reliance on China for rare earth minerals, which this bill would do by making it possible to stop mining, to continue to turn a blind eye to the children and others laboring in slave labor conditions in Congo, to continue to export our needs for rare earth minerals to other countries where damage to the environment is extraordinarily greater than would be the case here in America.

Why we persist in trying to export these horrific activities and try to pretend they are not happening is beyond me.

This rule that our bill would reverse gives us an opportunity to perhaps, at least start doing our part of shoring up the minerals necessary for all of the so-called green bad deal. I think it is referred to as the Green New Deal on the other side of the aisle or the green deal.

The point is that this bill would make it that much more difficult to obtain the minerals necessary in this country. This is truly overreach by the BLM and something that needs to be reversed.

To suggest that this has not been prioritized is incorrect at several levels, one of which I already called out. The other, you can go to page 19588 of the Register, and it calls out what conservation means. It says: “Within the framework of the proposed rule, ‘protection’ and ‘restoration’ together constitute conservation.”

Protection and restoration. Those words sound so great, but what it amounts to is a barrier to our entry upon some of those millions upon millions of acres of public land—another barrier, as if we didn't have enough.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3397, legislation that would require the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a finalized Biden administration rule that expands conservation on Federal land.

The rhetoric surrounding the BLM final rule has claimed it is nothing more than a mere land grab by the Federal Government, which could not be further from the truth.

The final rule is an avenue to conserving not only our public lands but also Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources.

The final rule allows sacred sites and cultural resources to be placed under conservation leases for preservation and protection. It is a step in the right direction to strengthen cultural prevention.

The United States has a shameful history of dispossession of land through Federal policy, statutes, and cultural and physical violence inflicted upon indigenous peoples, such as the Indian Removal Act and the dissolution of Tribal governments and reservations under the termination era.



Our government's past actions were not only a land grab from indigenous peoples but left a lasting impact on the generations to come.

These policies have led to many Tribal communities losing access to sacred sites, traditional foods, medicine, and resources, and they have led to intergenerational trauma.

As Members of Congress, we have an obligation to uphold the trust and treaty responsibility. While we have legislation such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, they are not implemented to the full degree of their intent.

BLM's final rule is an opportunity to strengthen existing protections for Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources.

We must ensure that all legislation passed through this Chamber strengthens Tribal sovereignty and cultural preservation.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would simply ensure that Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources would not be adversely impacted before the enactment of the legislation.

I hope my colleagues agree that we should ensure all legislation passed does not further contribute to cultural loss and destruction of sacred sites.

Instead, the legislation we pass should bring together Federal land managers and Tribal nations to develop land management policies that integrate traditional ecological knowledge and protections for sacred sites and cultural resources when proposed projects could impact Tribal nations and their citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

I would just simply add, and then I know we will continue with this debate, but echoing the sentiments of my colleague from California, there have been repeated, in my view, misstatements about the full ambit of the BLM rule.

To be crystal clear, this is from the executive summary of the rule, it says: "To support efforts to protect and restore public lands, the proposed rule clarifies that conservation is a use on par with other uses of the public lands under FLPMA's multiple-use and sustained-yield framework."

This is later in the same summary: "The rule does not prioritize conserva-

tion above other uses. Instead, it provides for considering and, where appropriate, implementing or authorizing conservation. . . ." on an equal footing with other uses consistent with the plain language of FLPMA. That is from the rule. Context matters, and I think it is an important clarification.

Lastly, I would say, Mr. Speaker, there was some commentary with respect to the full spectrum of engagement by the BLM with citizens across the country as it was promulgating this rule and reference was made to the locations where these forums were held.

I trust that the chairman, my good friend from Arkansas, has been to the communities that he listed—I certainly have—to Reno, to Albuquerque, and to Denver, and I can tell him that every one of those municipalities is nestled within 10, 15, 20, 25 miles of extensive lands that are managed both by the BLM and the Forest Service. How do I know? Because I live in Colorado, and I happen to represent many acres of land managed by the BLM.

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

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

As my colleague, Mr. BENTZ, read from the Federal Register and then my friend from Colorado read from the rule, the summary of the rule, I thought what would be more intellectually honest is if that summary said the proposed law because this goes way beyond a rule.

I also thought, who wrote this? And the answer is: I don't know. It is some nondescript bureaucrat over at the administration that wrote this law.

He is rewriting law, and as Congress, we have to stand up to the administration and say: Congress writes the laws, the administration enforces the law, and we have to put a stop to this administrative state that writes laws that have just as much effect as if Congress had passed a law.

If Congress wanted to add conservation, restoration, or mitigation to multiple use, then Congress should do that.

Right now, the law says: The multiple use is domestic livestock grazing, fish and wildlife development utilization, mineral exploration and production, rights-of-way, outdoor recreation, and timber production.

That is the law, and it is time that we put a stop to bureaucrats writing laws that are not held responsible by anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the WEST Act offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Only Congress has the authority over lands and territories in the United States and we have already spoken out on the BLM 2.0 rule that mimics, and we have defeated it.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management continues to sidestep congressional authority and has finalized a new rule to further restrict Federal lands for multiple use, including outdoor recreation, ranching, mineral development, and energy production.

Since his first day in office, Joe Biden has abused his authority to add large swaths of acreage to the Federal estate, ignoring the concerns of local communities and stakeholders, even to the point that last year, they were caught trying to amortize our public lands on the New York Stock Exchange.

Arizonans don't want another rule that blocks access to public lands. This new rule represents the latest rush to lock the gates on Federal lands by the Biden administration and directly threatens every aspect of American life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the WEST Act.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Our Nation is home to some of the most beautiful landscapes in the world. These public lands promote biodiversity, they support local economies through tourism and recreational opportunities, and really, they truly showcase what we mean when we sing "America the Beautiful."

I have been working my entire time in Congress to pass meaningful legislation that would conserve public lands in Colorado and beyond.

My home State of Colorado has more than 8.3 million acres of public lands, and the entire West has tens of millions of acres more.

Enjoying these public lands is intrinsic to the cultural idea of the American West and protecting them helps communities who are powered by outdoor recreation tourism.

These public lands are also vital in mitigating the impact of climate change and in improving the health of our planet.

Restoring and protecting ecosystems throughout the land supports the biodiversity of plants and animals, and it leads to a healthier balance for all of those who rely on these protections.

□ 1615

Last year, along with Senator MARTIN HEINRICH from New Mexico and Congressman JARED HUFFMAN from California, I called on the Department of the Interior to finalize the Conservation and Landscape Health rule, because BLM-managed lands are often overlooked in conversations about addressing biodiversity and climate change, even though these areas are some of the most unique and special public areas that we have throughout this country.

I was excited when the Biden administration finally announced the rule earlier this month because I knew it

would build on the administration's work to protect States like mine and to support a healthier and cleaner environment for all.

The rule is a major victory for preserving and protecting those landscapes and enhances our ability to ensure that future generations can enjoy them for years to come.

Just last week, I met in Denver—which by the way is just within a few miles of many of these lands that will be protected—with the Bureau of Land Management Colorado State Director Doug Vilsack, to discuss the importance of this rule, BLM's work in Colorado, and how we can protect additional lands throughout our country.

Congressman NEGUSE's and my home State of Colorado is doing zero for the important work that BLM is doing, and I support their efforts here in Congress because I know defending public lands is good public policy. Attacking our hardworking agency is not.

The bill we are considering today is a waste of our time, and it only serves one purpose: To undermine the important public land goals of the Biden administration.

By gutting this rule, Congressional Republicans would open the beautiful lands for exploitation and would prevent any administration from implementing any other rule that would further protect public lands. They are putting the mining and drilling lobby over the American people, millions of whom enjoy these lands every day.

This bill would also harm the local communities whose lifeblood is these important public lands. Western States, who are home to the overwhelming majority of BLM-managed lands, would be significantly impacted, and not in a good way, by this bill. These efforts are misguided, and they further reinforce that the majority is not focused on the issues that matter to our constituents.

I will continue to work to protect public lands, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit and "no" on this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arkansas for his work on this issue and also to the gentleman from Utah for sponsoring the legislation.

The Bureau of Land Management's recently finalized Public Lands Rule would fundamentally destroy the multiple-use land management policy Americans have relied on for decades.

I want to reinforce something my friend from Arkansas pointed out earlier. This is an administrative rule. This is not congressional action, yet it has the same force and effect of law. This is a rule BLM has put forth.

This policy is not just an addition of unnecessary bureaucratic red tape. It would effectively lock up 1 out of every 10 acres of land in the United States and thereby shatter the way of life for

many families and businesses across the West.

In my home State of Idaho, citizens have enjoyed the vast natural resources the State has had to offer for decades. Considering that BLM is responsible for managing about 12 million acres of Federal land in our State, this rule change will have drastic impact on the future of recreation, grazing, and natural resource production.

Now, as a fourth generation Idahoan, I am a proud supporter of the WEST Act as it defends the way of life for Americans across the West and empowers local voices.

By protecting the land used to feed and fuel our country, H.R. 3397 would safeguard some \$201 billion in economic output and protect 783,000 jobs in rural communities.

On a related note, thanks to this administration's open-border policy, our national security has pretty much been obliterated. That makes our enemies happy, especially considering that we are also dependent on those same enemies for our natural resources. This legislation actually reduces our reliance on foreign adversaries by maintaining domestic access to energy and mineral resources across the West, which is so important.

The WEST Act will protect public land management as we know it and safeguard the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN and Congressman CURTIS for leading the charge on stopping this disastrous Biden administration rule.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the WEST Act. This legislation will prohibit the BLM's Conservation and Landscape Health rule from going into effect.

Our past speaker just described very well the difference between rule and law. The BLM-proposed rule will lock up large swaths of public land across the country for Federal conservation leases that would limit recreational activities, timber production, animal grazing, and important energy development on public land. The rule is unconstitutional, it is unpopular, and it will devastate rural communities.

Article I, Section 1, of the United States Constitution makes it clear that Congress writes the law, not the executive branch. In 1934 and 1976, Congress passed the Taylor Grazing Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act. Both require a multiple use policy on public lands. This rule is unconstitutional because it circumvents both laws Congress passed to enforce an executive branch policy.

When collecting limited public input on this rule over a limited 75-day period, the BLM only allowed five public forums in exclusively urban city cen-

ters. This deliberate dodging of stakeholders whose land they are attempting to commandeer shows how little this administration cares about their scathing disapproval in rural America.

Lastly, this move will irreparably impede sustainable and productive grazing practices in Montana and devastate rural communities throughout the country by requiring ranchers to compete with coastal corporations for the limited number of available leases.

I am sick and tired of the American farmer, who creates food security, being trampled by radical environmentalists who think their soy burgers magically appear on grocery store shelves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

I would just simply say, again, there have been a number of misstatements with respect to the constitutionality and the statutory authority of this particular rule that has been promulgated by the BLM.

It is clearly constitutional. It is consistent with the statutory authority that Congress has ultimately conveyed to the BLM via FLPMA. You don't have to take my word for it. You can read the statute. Section 302 very clearly states that the agency has the authority to ultimately ensure multiple use by "the management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people."

Now, that phrase arguably could be nebulous to some. Well, the good news is that Congress did, in fact, clarify what those present and future needs of the American people happen to be. Again, I will quote from the statute: "The use of some land for less than all of the resources; a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources, including, but not limited to, recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, wildlife and fish, and natural, scenic, scientific and historical values; and harmonious and coordinated management of the . . . productivity of the land and the quality of the environment with consideration being given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output."

That is the statute. You have the statutory authority supporting a rule that by its plain language simply puts conservation on par with other uses. This is not complicated.

The American people support this rule. Hunters and anglers support this rule. Recreationists support this rule. Constituents in Colorado and States across the West support this rule, and so should the Congress.

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



Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Ms. MALOY).

Ms. MALOY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything my colleagues have said about this rule violating the intent of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, FLPMA, of 1976. I intended to spend most of my time talking about that, but it was pretty well covered.

This is an inappropriate use of an administrative action to change the intent of a legislative action. As a Member of Congress, I rise to support everything they have said about why that is wrong.

I also want to talk about what role BLM lands play in Utah. I represent Utah, and so does JOHN CURTIS, my colleague, who introduced this bill.

The reason this is so important for those of us in Utah is that the Federal Government manages most of the land in our State. There are counties in my district that are more than 90 percent managed by the Federal Government. A lot of that is BLM land. We have a lot of experience with multiple use, with grazing, logging, ranching, recreation, fishing, all the things we just talked about, coexisting in the same BLM tracts in Utah.

The reason this rule is deeply unpopular in my State is that it comes in and makes one use trump all of the other uses on what should be multiple-use land managed for sustained yield.

The role that BLM lands play in our economy and our culture cannot be overstated. In some of the counties I represent, the majority of families get at least part of their livelihood from grazing on public land. If those livelihoods go away, it will have a big impact on our economy. It also has a big impact on our lifestyle, our culture.

That is why changes like this should be made by Congress. They should be debated by people who represent the people in Utah or in other western States who are facing the same drastic cultural livelihood changes from this kind of rule, instead of this coming from an administration where it is written by bureaucrats who, like the chairman, I can't identify with.

I don't know who wrote the rule. I don't know what input they took from people in my district, but I know that I hear from people in my district, and I represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I have participated in a lot of debates during my time in Congress. This has got to be one of the most confounding for me, because repeatedly, unfortunately, I have colleagues, friends on the other side of the aisle, making statements about what this rule does when the plain language of the rule says the exact opposite.

There are folks here in the gallery, I suspect, who are just as confused as I

am. One need look no further than the plain language of the rule. The rule says that it is putting conservation on par with these other uses. Grazing is allowed under the rule. Oil and gas development is allowed under the rule. Conservation is allowed under the rule.

If my colleagues don't want conservation considered by the BLM with respect to how these lands are managed, which is clearly what they believe, then they should just say so.

□ 1630

They should just be candid with the American people that they don't think these lands should be managed with conservation in mind at all. I disagree with that view, and the American people disagree with that view, but that is an intellectually honest position.

Be that as it may, don't mischaracterize the rule that the agency ultimately promulgated because the American people can see it for themselves. They can read the same plain language that I have read repeatedly on the House floor over the course of the last hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, Congress charged the Bureau of Land Management with seeking balance statutorily. That is the word we used in the statute giving BLM its authority: "so that they are utilized in a combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people." That is what the Biden administration has done with respect to the development of this rule.

When we had the hearing on this bill in the Natural Resources Committee, a constituent of mine testified in support of the bill. Eagle County Commissioner Kathy Chandler-Henry said that she made the trip to Washington to be here to support this particular rule.

I think her testimony said it best, so I will quote it here: "I support the BLM's proposed public lands rule. It will empower the agency to deliver on its multiple-use mandate by placing conservation values on equal footing with other uses on our public lands."

That is it. People in Colorado, in my State, in my district, and throughout the West rely on our public lands for a wide variety of uses and benefits.

I speak with some authority on this particular subject because I represent a congressional district that is larger than eight States in the Union. That includes over 40 percent of it being public lands managed by the BLM and the Forest Service. When I talk about the need to prioritize resilience and balance, I speak about it on behalf of those communities that I am so honored to represent.

I appreciate the dialogue that we have had with my colleague from Utah and, of course, with my friend, the chairman from Arkansas, but I respectfully disagree with respect to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that perhaps my colleagues will see the light and vote against H.R. 3397. I certainly will be. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid making reference to occupants of the gallery.

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

Mr. Speaker, we really must pass Representative CURTIS' WEST Act.

This burdensome and unnecessary law that is being disguised as a rule is not only a threat to the West, but it is also a threat to our national security, to American energy dominance, to our food security, to the environment, and to the separation of powers that are established in our Constitution.

Passing the WEST Act and withdrawing this rule will restore Congress' intent over the multiple uses of BLM land and protect the over 700,000 jobs across the West that rely on access to our public lands.

We can't allow the Biden administration to singlehandedly upend 50 years of congressionally mandated land use policies to the whim of environmental extremists and coastal elites. We can't allow an unelected, unaccountable, and unnamed bureaucrat to write law.

I thank Representative CURTIS for his strong leadership on this issue. I know that he has heard many concerns about the rule from his constituents, including as recently as last week at a Federal Lands Subcommittee hearing in southern Utah.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kamlager-Dove of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3397 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE is as follows:

Ms. Kamlager-Dove moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3397 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 2 of this Act shall not take effect until the Secretaries determine, in consultation with Tribes, that section 2 of this Act will not have an adverse impact on Tribal cultural or sacred sites.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 3397, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 615;

Passage of H.R. 615, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 764;

Passage of H.R. 764, if ordered;

The motion to recommit H.R. 3195; and

Passage of H.R. 3195, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 210, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—204

Aguilar	Frost	Mrvan
Allred	Gallego	Mullin
Amo	Garamendi	Nadler
Auchincloss	Garcia (IL)	Napolitano
Balint	Garcia (TX)	Neal
Barragán	Garcia, Robert	Neguse
Beatty	Golden (ME)	Norcross
Bera	Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Beyer	Gomez	Omar
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Blunt Rochester	Vicente	Panetta
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Pappas
Bowman	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarell
Boyle (PA)	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Brown	Hayes	Peltola
Brownley	Himes	Perez
Budzinski	Horsford	Peters
Bush	Houlihan	Pettersen
Caraveo	Hoyer	Phillips
Carbajal	Hoyle (OR)	Pingree
Cardenas	Huffman	Pocan
Carson	Ivey	Porter
Carter (LA)	Jackson (IL)	Pressley
Cartwright	Jackson (NC)	Quigley
Casar	Jackson Lee	Ramirez
Case	Jacobs	Raskin
Casten	Jayapal	Ross
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cherfilus-	Kamlager-Dove	Ryan
McCormick	Kaptur	Salinas
Chu	Keating	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Scanlon
Cleaver	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schiff
Cohen	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Scholten
Correa	Kuster	Schrier
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Craig	Lee (CA)	Sewell
Crockett	Lee (NV)	Sherman
Crow	Lee (PA)	Sherrill
Cuellar	Leger Fernandez	Slotkin
Davids (KS)	Levin	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Lieu	Sorensen
Davis (NC)	Lofgren	Soto
Dean (PA)	Lynch	Spanberger
DeGette	Manning	Stansbury
DeLauro	Matsui	Stanton
DelBene	McBath	Stevens
Deluzio	McClellan	Strickland
DeSaulnier	McCollum	Suozi
Dingell	McGarvey	Swalwell
Doggett	McGovern	Takano
Escobar	Meeks	Thanedar
Eshoo	Menendez	Thompson (CA)
Espallat	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Evans	Mfume	Titus
Fletcher	Moore (WI)	Tlaib
Foster	Morelle	Tokuda
Foushee	Moskowitz	Tonko
Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Torres (CA)

Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez

Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—210

Aderholt	Garbarino	Miller (OH)
Alford	Garcia, Mike	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gimenez	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Mills
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Molinaro
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Moolenaar
Bacon	Gosar	Mooney
Baird	Granger	Moore (AL)
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Moore (UT)
Banks	Graves (MO)	Moran
Barr	Green (TN)	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bentz	Griffith	Nunn (IA)
Bergman	Grothman	Obernolte
Bice	Guest	Ogles
Biggs	Guthrie	Owens
Bilirakis	Hageman	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Pence
Boebert	Harshbarger	Perry
Bost	Hern	Pfuger
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Buchanan	Hill	Reschenthaler
Bucshon	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Burchett	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Huizenga	Rose
Calvert	Hunt	Rosendale
Cammack	Issa	Rouzer
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Roy
Carl	James	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Chavez-DeRemer	Jordan	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Self
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Sessions
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kiley	Smucker
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Staubert
Curtis	LaHood	Steel
D'Esposito	LaLota	Stefanik
Davidson	LaMalfa	Steil
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Steube
DesJarlais	Latta	Strong
Donalds	LaTurner	Tenney
Duarte	Lawler	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Timmons
Edwards	Letlow	Turner
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Valadao
Emmer	Lucas	Van Drew
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Van Dwyne
Ezell	Luna	Van Orden
Fallon	Luttrell	Wagner
Feenstra	Mace	Walberg
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Waltz
Finstad	Maloy	Weber (TX)
Fischbach	Mann	Webster (FL)
Fitzgerald	Massie	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Westerman
Fleischmann	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Flood	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fox	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Franklin, Scott	McCormick	Wittman
Fry	McHenry	Womack
Fulcher	Meuser	Yakym
Gaetz	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1704

Messrs. GOODEN of Texas, MOORE of Alabama, BARR, FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CAMMACK, Messrs. COMER, NEWHOUSE, and LUCAS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PETERS, Ms. MANNING, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. SPANBERGER, Messrs. DOGGETT, MORELLE, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ,

and Mr. AGUILAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 164.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 212, noes 202, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Foxx	Maloy
Alford	Franklin, Scott	Mann
Allen	Fry	Massie
Amodei	Fulcher	Mast
Armstrong	Gaetz	McCaul
Babin	Garbarino	McClain
Bacon	Garcia, Mike	McClintock
Baird	Gimenez	McCormick
Balderson	Golden (ME)	McHenry
Banks	Gonzales, Tony	Meuser
Barr	Good (VA)	Miller (IL)
Bean (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)
Bentz	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Bergman	Granger	Miller-Meeks
Bice	Graves (LA)	Mills
Biggs	Graves (MO)	Molinaro
Bilirakis	Green (TN)	Moolenaar
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Mooney
Boebert	Griffith	Moore (AL)
Bost	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Brecheen	Guest	Moran
Buchanan	Guthrie	Newhouse
Bucshon	Hageman	Norman
Burchett	Harris	Nunn (IA)
Burgess	Harshbarger	Obernolte
Burlison	Hern	Ogles
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Owens
Cammack	Hill	Palmer
Carey	Hinson	Pence
Carl	Houchin	Perez
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Perry
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Pfuger
Chavez-DeRemer	Hunt	Posey
Ciscomani	Issa	Reschenthaler
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)
Cloud	James	Rogers (AL)
Clyde	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Comer	Jordan	Rosendale
Crane	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Crenshaw	Kean (NJ)	Rutherford
Cuellar	Kelly (MS)	Salazar
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
D'Esposito	Kiggans (VA)	Schweikert
Davidson	Kiley	Scott, Austin
De La Cruz	Kim (CA)	Self
DesJarlais	Kustoff	Sessions
Donalds	LaHood	Simpson
Duarte	LaLota	Smith (MO)
Duncan	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Dunn (FL)	Lamborn	Smucker
Edwards	Latta	Spartz
Ellzey	LaTurner	Staubert
Emmer	Lawler	Steel
Estes	Lee (FL)	Stefanik
Ezell	Lesko	Steil
Fallon	Letlow	Steube
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Strong
Ferguson	Lucas	Tenney
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Fischbach	Luna	Tiffany
Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Timmons
Fleischmann	Mace	Turner
Flood	Malliotakis	Valadao

Van Drew	Weber (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Van Duyne	Webster (FL)	Wittman
Van Orden	Wenstrup	Womack
Wagner	Westerman	Yakym
Walberg	Williams (NY)	Zinke
Waltz	Williams (TX)	

## NOES—202

Aguilar	Garcia, Robert	Pappas
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Pascarell
Amo	Gomez	Pelosi
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Peltola
Balint	Vicente	Peters
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pettersen
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Phillips
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Beyer	Hayes	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Porter
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Pressley
Bonamici	Houlahan	Quigley
Bowman	Hoyer	Ramirez
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin
Brown	Huffman	Ross
Brownley	Ivey	Ruiz
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Bush	Jackson (NC)	Ryan
Caraveo	Jacobs	Salinas
Carbajal	Jayapal	Sánchez
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Carson	Johnson (GA)	Scanlon
Carter (LA)	Kamlager-Dove	Schakowsky
Cartwright	Kaptur	Schiff
Casar	Keating	Schneider
Case	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Casten	Khanna	Schrier
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Scott, David
Cherfilus-	Kim (NJ)	Sewell
McCormick	Krishnamoorthi	Sherman
Chu	Kuster	Sherill
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Slotkin
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Smith (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sorensen
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Soto
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Connolly	Lee (PA)	Stansbury
Correa	Leger Fernandez	Stanton
Costa	Levin	Stevens
Courtney	Lieu	Strickland
Craig	Lofgren	Suozzi
Crockett	Lynch	Swalwell
Crow	Manning	Takano
Davids (KS)	Matsui	Thanedar
Davis (IL)	McBath	Thompson (CA)
Davis (NC)	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
Dean (PA)	McCollum	Titus
DeGette	McGarvey	Tlaib
DeLauro	McGovern	Tokuda
DelBene	Meeks	Tonko
Deluzio	Menendez	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Meng	Torres (NY)
Dingell	Mfume	Trahan
Doggett	Moore (WI)	Underwood
Escobar	Morelle	Vargas
Eshoo	Moskowitz	Vasquez
Españlat	Moulton	Veasey
Evans	Mrvan	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Mullin	Wasserman
Fletcher	Nadler	Schultz
Foster	Napolitano	Waters
Foushee	Neal	Watson Coleman
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	Wexton
Frost	Norcross	Wild
Gallo	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Pallone	
Garcia (TX)	Panetta	

## NOT VOTING—15

Adams	Grijalva	Nehls
Arrington	Jackson Lee	Nickel
Blumenauer	Langworthy	Smith (NE)
Cole	Magaziner	Sykes
Diaz-Balart	Murphy	Trone

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1710

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT OF 2023

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 615) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 204, nays 211, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

## YEAS—204

Aguilar	Frankel, Lois	Moskowitz
Allred	Galleo	Moulton
Amo	Garamendi	Mrvan
Auchincloss	Garcia (IL)	Mullin
Balint	Garcia (TX)	Nadler
Barragán	Garcia, Robert	Napolitano
Beatty	Golden (ME)	Neal
Bera	Goldman (NY)	Neguse
Beyer	Gomez	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez
Blunt Rochester	Vicente	Omar
Bonamici	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bowman	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Boyle (PA)	Harder (CA)	Pappas
Brown	Hayes	Pascarell
Brownley	Himes	Pelosi
Budzinski	Horsford	Peltola
Bush	Houlahan	Perez
Caraveo	Hoyer	Peters
Carbajal	Hoyle (OR)	Pettersen
Cárdenas	Huffman	Phillips
Carson	Ivey	Pingree
Carter (LA)	Jackson (IL)	Pocan
Cartwright	Jackson (NC)	Porter
Casar	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Case	Jacobs	Quigley
Casten	Jayapal	Ramirez
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Raskin
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Cherfilus-	Kamlager-Dove	Ruiz
McCormick	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Chu	Keating	Ryan
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Salinas
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Sánchez
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cohen	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Correa	Kuster	Schneider
Costa	Landsman	Scholten
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Craig	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Crockett	Lee (CA)	Scott, David
Crow	Lee (NV)	Sewell
Cuellar	Lee (PA)	Sherman
Davids (KS)	Leger Fernandez	Sherrill
Davis (IL)	Levin	Slotkin
Davis (NC)	Lieu	Smith (WA)
Dean (PA)	Lofgren	Sorensen
DeGette	Lynch	Soto
DeLauro	Manning	Spanberger
DelBene	Matsui	Stansbury
Deluzio	McBath	Stanton
DeSaulnier	McClellan	Stevens
Dingell	McCollum	Strickland
Doggett	McGarvey	Suozzi
Escobar	McGovern	Swalwell
Eshoo	Meeks	Takano
Españlat	Menendez	Thanedar
Evans	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Fletcher	Mfume	Thompson (MS)
Foster	Moore (WI)	Titus
Foushee	Morelle	Tlaib

Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood

Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

## NAYS—211

Aderholt	Garbarino	Miller (WV)
Alford	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gimenez	Mills
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Molinaro
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Bacon	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Baird	Granger	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Moran
Banks	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Griffith	Oberholte
Bergman	Grothman	Ogles
Bice	Guest	Owens
Biggs	Guthrie	Palmer
Bilirakis	Hageman	Pence
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Perry
Boebert	Harshbarger	Pfuger
Bost	Hern	Posey
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Buchanan	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Bucshon	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Burchett	Houchin	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hudson	Rose
Burlison	Huizenga	Rosendale
Calvert	Hunt	Rouzer
Cammack	Issa	Roy
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carl	James	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Chavez-DeRemer	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Ciscomani	Joyce (OH)	Self
Cline	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Cloud	Kean (NJ)	Simpson
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smucker
Crane	Kiley	Spartz
Crawford	Kim (CA)	Stauber
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Steel
Curtis	LaHood	Stefanik
D'Esposito	LaLota	Steube
Davidson	LaMalfa	Strong
De La Cruz	Lamborn	Tenney
DesJarlais	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	LaTurner	Tiffany
Duarte	Lawler	Timmons
Duncan	Lee (FL)	Turner
Dunn (FL)	Lesko	Valadao
Edwards	Letlow	Van Drew
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Van Duyne
Emmer	Lucas	Van Orden
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Ezell	Luna	Walberg
Fallon	Luttrell	Waltz
Feenstra	Mace	Maloy
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Mann
Finstad	Maloy	Massie
Fischbach	Mann	Mast
Fitzgerald	Massie	Fleischmann
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Flood
Flood	Fleischmann	Fox
Fox	Flood	Franklin, Scott
Franklin, Scott	Fox	Frost
Frost	Franklin, Scott	Fry
Fry	Frost	Fulcher
Fulcher	Fry	Gaetz
Gaetz	Fulcher	

## NOT VOTING—14

Adams	Grijalva	Nickel
Arrington	Langworthy	Smith (NE)
Blumenauer	Magaziner	Sykes
Cole	Murphy	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Nehls	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1716

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.