

confronting Iran's aggression to recognizing Jerusalem as our capital and moving the American Embassy there. That is Jerusalem, our eternal capital, never to be divided again.

My dear friends, Democrats and Republicans, despite these times of upheaval, I am hopeful about the future. I am hopeful about Israel because my people, the Jewish people, emerged from the depths of hell, from dispossession and genocide, and against all odds, we restored our sovereignty in our ancient homeland. We built a powerful and vibrant democracy, a democracy that pushes the boundaries of innovation for the betterment of all humanity.

I am hopeful about America because I am hopeful about Americans. I know how much the people of this country have sacrificed to defend freedom.

America will continue to be a force for light and good in a dark and dangerous world. For free peoples everywhere, America remains the beacon of liberty its extraordinary Founders envisioned back in 1776.

Working together, I am confident that our two Nations will vanquish the tyrants and terrorists who threaten us both.

As Israel's Prime Minister, I promise you this: No matter how long it takes, no matter how difficult the road ahead, Israel will not relent. Israel will not bend. We will defend our land. We will defend our people. We will fight until we achieve victory, victory over liberty—rather, victory of liberty over tyranny, victory of life over death, victory of good over evil. That is our solemn commitment.

We will continue to work with the United States and our Arab partners to transform our troubled region from a backwater of oppression, poverty, and war into a thriving oasis of dignity, prosperity, and peace.

In this noble mission, as in many others, Israel will always remain America's indispensable ally.

Through thick and thin and in good times and in bad, Israel will always be your loyal friend and your steadfast partner.

On behalf of the people of Israel, I came here today to say: Thank you, America. Thank you for your support and solidarity. Thank you for standing with Israel in our hour of need. Together, we shall defend our common civilization. Together, we shall secure a brilliant future for both our nations.

May God bless Israel, may God bless America, and may God bless the great alliance between Israel and America forever.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m., His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps from the Chamber.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1554

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JAMES) at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 24, 2024, at 11:53 a.m.

That the Senate passed S. 3696.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1076.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Acting Clerk.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 8998.

Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1555

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8998) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes, with Mr. NORMAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 57 printed in part B of House report 118–602 offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in part B of House Report 118–602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Lime Manufacturing Plants Technology Review” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on July 16, 2024 (89 Fed. Reg. 57738).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency recently finalized a \$2 billion regulation on the lime industry that the EPA's own staff have found is completely unnecessary to protect public health and welfare.

Lime plants not only supply products essential for the proper function of critical activities concerning construction, but lime also keeps our roadways from breaking down and helps keep our water clean.

As recently as 2020, just 4 years ago, the EPA conducted a full risk assessment of hazardous air pollutants emitted by the lime manufacturing industry. The EPA found that risks from the source category are acceptable, the standards provide an ample margin of safety to protect public health, and more stringent standards are not necessary to prevent an adverse environmental effect. The EPA received no new data or other information during the public comment period that causes us to change that proposed determination. I emphasize that is the EPA's own staff and scientists.

This was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER in July of 2020. What is interesting is that lime is used for pollution control to absorb sulfur oxides, which helps prevent acid rain and reduces emissions of hazardous air pollutants, including mercury.

The only reason the Biden administration's EPA is issuing this expensive

and unnecessary rule is because of a 2-1 split decision where the District of Columbia circuit court sided with an environmental group suing to ignore the EPA's scientific findings in favor of their radical climate agenda.

That case said that the EPA must set standards for all unregulated hazardous air pollutants when the agency conducts a technology review under the Clean Air Act. Congress intended that new, additional regulations should be added only if risk assessment demonstrated that risks are not acceptable with an ample margin of safety. Since the EPA has already found that emissions from the lime industry are already acceptable with an ample margin of safety, there is no need for these new, expensive regulations. I urge my colleagues to trust the science and support my amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, the Interior bill we are considering today includes 92 poison pill riders in the base bill that cripple environmental protection, undermine climate change policies, add to the national debt, and include discriminatory riders targeting millions of American citizens that have already proven so divisive in earlier markups. I object to the inclusion of any more.

This amendment would block the EPA from implementing air pollution regulations for lime manufacturing plants. The EPA rule will reduce emissions of toxic air pollution by nearly 900 tons per year from hazardous air pollutants such as dioxin and mercury.

EPA initiated this rulemaking as required by a court case to comply with their 8-year technology review timeline required under the Clean Air Act.

As a result of the lawsuit and subsequent emissions data collection, EPA found four pollutants that were unregulated in proposed reasonable standards to achieve better air quality and public health.

EPA worked closely with the Small Business Administration and included regulatory flexibilities to address small business concerns.

EPA balanced industry concerns alongside their duty to protect public health and the environment in this rule, and they were statutorily required to update.

□ 1600

The rule is important to the people who live in communities next to these facilities, to the workers at these facilities, and it is critical that this rule go into effect and not be a political pawn in the appropriations process.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, this amendment would be a step toward returning

power back to Congress, where it belongs. Instead of complying with the agenda of radical environmentalists, Congress should reject their efforts to ignore science. I remind my colleagues that the EPA's own scientists said this rule is not necessary.

We have too many unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats making way too many laws in the form of regulations that are doing great harm to Americans struggling to pay their bills, struggling to put food on the table, and struggling to take care of their families.

This lime rule is another example of the fake science that is doing unnecessary harm to our economy and to American households.

I emphasize again, lime plants supply products essential to the proper functioning of critical activities to the national interest, including steel production, road construction, power generation, pollution abatement. As I pointed out, one of the things that my colleague mentioned was mercury. Lime is used to abate mercury in air.

I worked for two international engineering companies, and we built pollution control devices, including devices that use lime to remove sulfur oxides from gases being emitted from production facilities. It is used in drinking water treatment. Lime helps keep our roadways, as I said, from breaking down. Lime helps keep our water clean, and lime improves soil quality.

Unnecessary regulations like the lime rule add to the inflationary burden Americans are currently suffering under. The high price of building a new home, for instance, has placed home ownership out of reach of many Americans, and this lime rule will add to that cost. Funding this regulation would only make the high cost of living crisis worse.

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

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

As I said, having worked for two international engineering companies and in a think tank, I have found during my time in Congress that there is a serious lack of scientific understanding, and we just pass a lot of rules out of Congress that we really have no idea what the impact will be.

We also have, in many cases, a serious math problem. We don't understand how these things add up, pile up the cost of living on American households and the damage that it is doing to them. Right now, we are seeing grocery prices at levels we haven't seen in years. Cumulative inflation the last 3½ years of the Biden administration has been over 19 percent. Energy costs are up 40 percent. We just keep adding these things to the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject the burdensome regulations, reject the radical environmental agenda, and support my amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. I do want to assure my colleague on the other side of the aisle that I thoroughly understand the importance of lime in many manufacturing and agricultural processes. I actually have a cement manufacturing facility in my district, agricultural lime facility in my district, and I personally have spent many years as a farmer or gardener.

Just last week, I spread lime on my soil to make it more alkaline because we have very acidic soils in much of Maine. I am not unaware of the importance of lime, but I am also aware of our role in Congress of making sure that we reduce pollution and that we make sure we keep our citizens safe. This is a perfectly appropriate rule.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the EPA from using funds for actions pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

To be clear, section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emissions levels to whatever level the agency deems appropriate if they find U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control these emissions in their own nation, such as the Paris climate accord.

This backdoor provision allows the EPA to vastly expand its regulatory authority and encroach on the right of the States to regulate their own energy sectors based on the actions solely of a foreign nation.

It is irresponsible to allow unelected bureaucrats at the EPA to retain the ability to seize such expansive authority. If the U.S. Government wants to pursue such a policy, one that in my opinion is constitutionally suspect, it

should be done through an explicit congressional delegation of authority on a case-by-case basis.

A similar amendment has passed the House during previous Interior and Environmental Appropriations packages. I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, section 115 of the Clean Air Act is essential. It enables the United States to work with other nations to address transboundary air pollution.

As we saw last year, while Canada was experiencing historic wildfires, that pollution knows no boundaries and can travel anywhere, whether by air or water. We cannot address these environmental issues on our own, and we must work with other nations.

Prohibiting the EPA from implementing section 115 of the Clean Air Act is shortsighted, and I oppose this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that we need to work with other nations and our neighbors, everybody around the globe. We are living on the same planet, breathing the same air, drinking the same water, but the United States is a sovereign nation, and we don't bow to any other sovereign, let alone take their word for it or have them impose regulations on us as they deem fit, as they see fit.

That is what section 115 would allow. It allows a backdoor access to doing so through a reciprocal agreement, not even a treaty, such as the Paris climate accord. That is the issue here, an agreement that an administration may take, that not this body, not the body across the building, not the American people are signatories to. That is the purpose of this amendment.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, in the past, this amendment has been accepted on this very bill, this very same amendment, and so I would urge adoption once again this time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, once again, this is just common sense. I don't know that back a long time ago when section 115 was written it was written with the idea that the Paris climate accord, not a treaty, but with the force of a treaty would occur, but in the case that it is and that that has now happened, we must make sure that we speak loudly and that any regulations and any regulatory authority come through the elected bodies of the United States of America, not through bureaucracies and certainly not through would-be treaties or agreements from foreign countries.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction account), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the actions described as a "backstop" in the December 29, 2009, letter from the Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State's watershed implementation and referred to in enclosure B of such letter.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to take retaliatory actions against States that disagree with the EPA-mandated pollutant reduction goals that have been imposed upon them by the EPA.

Importantly, this amendment would not prevent the EPA from working with States to restore things like the Chesapeake Bay, which is what the EPA is supposed to be doing.

In 1985, the States in the Chesapeake Bay region recognized the need to address pollutants in the Bay and through their own initiative came together to conduct cleanup efforts. These State-driven efforts were largely successful. Water quality improved almost 50 percent from 1985 to 2010 without the EPA's involvement.

However, in 2010, the EPA seized the States' authority to determine their own method of compliance and threatened to take over the water quality plants. This 2010 power grab, known as the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, total maximum daily load, directly contradicts the intent of the Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act clearly acknowledges State authority in water quality and requires cooperation, which is happening through the Chesapeake Bay Commission rather than coercion between the States and the Federal Government.

These coercive methods have been tried and have failed. Water quality

improvement has slowed, and last year the EPA acknowledged the 2025 goals likely cannot be met. The failures we have seen since Federalization of the bay cleanup efforts necessitate the re-evaluation of this model and a return to the cooperative model that led to the early improvements and actual success.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow those that pollute the Chesapeake Bay to ignore the Environmental Protection Agency's water quality standards.

Restoring the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed continues to be a priority. The EPA established mandatory water quality standards, and Congress has appropriated over \$1 billion for the Chesapeake Bay program to help States, localities, and businesses meet those standards. This amendment would jeopardize that funding and have devastating effects on the health of the bay.

This amendment is not about the well-being of Virginia, Maryland, and the surrounding States. It is about the fact that some industrial operators don't think they should be responsible for controlling the pollution they dump into our rivers and streams across the country. The courts have sided with the EPA on this matter.

For more than 35 years, the regional partnership created through the Chesapeake Bay program has sought to restore and protect the Nation's largest and most productive estuary. This amendment would undermine decades of work and have lasting damaging effects to the health of the bay and the economy that it supports.

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

□ 1615

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, let me clarify, prohibits the use of funds to take retaliatory actions—retaliatory. We are already working together. We are working with the EPA. As was said, this is a regional partnership and has been a regional partnership.

This isn't about industry getting a free pass to pollute anywhere. This is about the heavy-handed, coercive tactics of the EPA on States that want to do this, that got into this because this is what they wanted to do. We don't need the EPA.

By the way, go to some of these treatment plants, and do you know what the EPA's requirements are, Mr. Chairman? Beyond the limits of technology. They have to treat the water to beyond the limits of technology. Think about what that statement says. It says they can't get there from here, but the EPA is still going to fine them if they can't get there from here while

acknowledging they can't get there from here.

All we are saying is, don't spend money on the extortionary, retaliatory, coercive tactics. Spend the money, if you are going to spend it, on actually working together to clean up the bay.

Mr. Chair, I don't know what else you need to hear. We are not against the EPA. We are not against cleaning up the bay. We are not against spending the money to clean up the bay. What we are against is the retaliatory actions that don't help clean up the bay and waste our money.

By the way, since we are talking about it, while Pennsylvania continues to try to get beyond the limits of technology, that the EPA acknowledges, some of the other States in the compact aren't interested but aren't fined under these retaliatory practices. This is punishment to some States but not to others, which we see as unfair, as you might imagine.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine has the right to close.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I think I have made my point, and the fact that the gentlewoman is reserving means there is no other point to make, so I am happy to listen.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, any time I hear one of my colleagues across the aisle say we don't need the EPA or that the actions of the EPA are extortion or retaliatory, I don't know about the specific actions that he is talking about today, but I do know, as someone who represents a State with as much coastline as any State in the Nation with estuaries, with bays, with an extreme dependence on our shorelines, on our watersheds, on the ocean itself, I know that the Chesapeake Bay is an incredible resource to this country. The health of the bay has been a big concern for over 35 years, and the work that the EPA does to keep it clean is extremely important.

This amendment that attempts to undermine those efforts, to undermine decades of work, is absolutely unnecessary and not anything that any of us should support. This has the likely impact of undermining the efforts of our fishermen, our residents of coastal communities, and the economy in the Chesapeake Bay, and it is a misguided amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 145, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 226, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment strikes the funding for the Council on Environmental Quality.

Now, it sounds lofty and awesome. The Council on Environmental Quality was created by the National Environmental Policy Act in 1969 to advance environmental policies and to meet requirements under NEPA. Of course, it is duplicative because now we have the EPA. We create a new agency, but we never get rid of the other agency, and they both do the same thing.

This one is supercharged now. This administration has tasked the CEQ with developing policies on climate change, environmental justice, and Federal sustainability, all while creating more paperwork under NEPA that the previous administration actually worked to reverse.

Mr. Chairman, these policies are what is holding America back. Onerous NEPA requirements and State-level laws like those in California are holding back countless programs and construction projects around the country. You can't get anything permitted. Things take years upon years. People say, why does it take so long? This is why.

They are also part of the left's apparatus that aims to shift America's entire way of life by meeting unscientific emission goals. They are not scientific. They are political goals. They are not scientific goals.

As written, the Department of Energy's own estimate for their gas stove rule shows that only 4 percent of gas stoves available on the market today meet the new standard, essentially forcing Americans to choose electric stoves without any—it is not based on science. They just want you to use electricity, not gas, and so they come up with the metrics.

This is part of this Council on Environmental Quality. We don't need them. We have the EPA. We don't need the duplication.

Mr. Chair, I urge support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment eliminates funding for the Council on Environmental Quality.

The office is responsible for coordinating the Federal Government's efforts to improve, preserve, and protect Americans' public health and environment. It also works to ensure that environmental reviews for infrastructure projects and Federal actions are thorough, efficient, and reflect the input of the public and local communities.

This amendment would hobble the office and result in significant delays to infrastructure projects around the country.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I don't know about significant delays. We are already experiencing significant delays. All these construction projects take decades to complete.

If we are going to just keep doing the same thing, which apparently that is what the gentlewoman on the other side of aisle wants to do, we are going to continue to experience significant delays.

Maybe this isn't the answer. I would be happy to hear what the answer is if it is not this, but doing the same thing isn't going to change anything. That is what we are looking to do, to make it more efficient.

The EPA can do this work. The EPA should do this work. We don't need both these agencies at the same time duplicating each other's efforts and wasting American tax dollars.

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

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

NO DESIGNATION OF PERMIAN BASIN AS
NONATTAINMENT FOR OZONE

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to designate or redesignate the Permian Basin (or any portion thereof) as nonattainment for ozone under section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, two summers ago, the EPA released a regulatory agenda which included the consideration of redesignation of ozone attainment in the Permian Basin.

This wholly discretionary action would impose new regulatory burdens, new regulations on the U.S. oil and gas industry, which will only worsen the cost-of-living problems that we already have and the high energy problems that we are already experiencing.

A nonattainment redesignation will have considerable, almost an unbelievable, negative local impacts that cannot be overstated. In rural America, the energy industry generates high-paying jobs for working families and is the driver of the Texas and New Mexico economies.

Additionally, the industry annually contributes over \$20 billion to State of Texas local coffers to fund public education, emergency responders, hospitals, conservation projects, and more. If the EPA finalizes this redesignation, most rural communities in this area will face substantial economic hardship. Somebody is going to have to make up that money.

By the way, it is not just Texas and the Permian Basin. If you ever travel there, if you are in the airport, you will see people traveling to and from the Permian Basin because of the jobs there. They are going to the basin for the jobs. They are flying back to the East Coast. They will work a couple of weeks on and take a week off and go back to the East Coast, so it is not just the Permian Basin that is going to be affected. It is States like Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Georgia, where the men and women that I talked to when I was there in the airport were traveling to and from.

In May of this year, Representative PFLUGER hosted the Region 6 Administrator to see the impacts of a potential redesignation and the actions producers are already taking to reduce emissions to record levels.

During her visit, it was made clear that the EPA does not have monitors on the Texas side of the Permian Basin. They don't even have monitors there. All the data that is being used to build the case for the nonattainment redesignation is based on either modeling or monitors in some other State, not even in Texas.

We have seen this before. That is why Representative PFLUGER recently in-

troduced the Show the Data Act, which mandates that any nonattainment redesignation by the EPA cannot be based on air quality monitor data from some other State, area, or counties being designated. They have to be in the county, in the State. That would be nice.

The Permian Basin is proud of its environmental record. Their producers have led the world in emissions reduction, innovation, and sustainable practices. Permian Basin producers continue to reduce emissions of ozone precursors while increasing energy production.

As a matter of fact, methane emissions intensity in the Permian Basin dropped by nearly 70 percent between 2011 and 2020 even as oil and gas production in the region rose by over 320 percent. They didn't need the Federal Government coming down there with monitors outside the area telling them how to do that.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is a legislative earmark to benefit oil and gas producers. It would tell the EPA to ignore potentially unhealthy air in the counties that make up the Permian Basin.

For the past few years, air monitors located in the Permian Basin area have shown violations well above EPA's 2015 ozone standard. So it is more than reasonable for the EPA to evaluate conditions in the area, consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, but this amendment would prevent the EPA from redesignating the Permian Basin as being in nonattainment of the 2015 ozone standard.

Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to set a national ambient air quality standard for contaminants, like ground-level ozone, that are adequate to protect public health, including the health of sensitive groups such as children and the elderly.

These health-based standards, the NAAQS, must reflect recent scientific and medical data. Once the EPA sets or revises the NAAQS, EPA uses air monitoring data and recommendations from States to determine which areas meet the standards and those that do not, known as being in nonattainment.

□ 1630

States then go to work to develop plans using the most cost-effective strategies to bring nonattainment areas in compliance with the standard.

Allowing a region that exceeds the standard to be considered in attainment doesn't do anything for the families and the workers living in those counties breathing the toxic air. It tells Americans that there is nothing to see here while they bear the brunt of the environmental hazards.

Contrary to what polluters would have you believe, being designated as nonattainment does not shut down the economies. Businesses have and do continue to operate and expand in nonattainment areas. However, the designation ensures that States and businesses are taking measures to control air pollution and help communities to achieve cleaner, healthier air.

The Interior bill we are considering today includes 92 poison pill riders in the base bill, and I object to the inclusion of any more.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I suspect that Representative PFLUGER would be aghast at the claim that this is a legislative earmark. There is no money involved in this.

By the way, the air quality has continued to improve. Since 1990, ozone concentration has decreased by 25 percent and emissions of ozone precursors like VOCs and nitrogen oxides have dropped by 47 percent and 65 percent.

Let me just tell you, Mr. Chairman: This is how this goes. The EPA sets a level through the Clean Air Act, they attain it, and then the EPA just keeps lowering it and lowering it and lowering it. It is used by the left by people who hate the oil and gas industry, hate civilization, and hate energy to say that you can no longer produce because you can't attain it. That's what they do.

To say it is not going to have any effect if we put them in the nonattainment zone, it is not going to have any effect on the producers, on local businesses—if it is not going to have any effect, then why would you do it? It is going to have an effect.

They are going to be out of jobs. That is the effect. It is a thinly veiled attempt to curb oil and gas production, and it will destroy local jobs, State revenues, and, more importantly, our national security.

Do you think China or Russia, which country that is competing with us in the oil and gas industry, which country do you think is telling their producers that they are not meeting attainment? None of them. Do you think Iran is doing that?

We are buying Venezuelan oil. We are buying Russian gas in the northeast. It is absurd. Congress must not allow this to move forward.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, my colleague on the other side of the aisle said that I hate oil and gas, I hate civilization, and I hate energy. Honestly, I don't hate oil and gas. I certainly don't hate civilization. In fact, I hope we can continue our civilization.

I am deeply concerned that if we continue our dependence on oil and gas that we won't have a civilization, that our children and grandchildren won't have the opportunities that we had, that our small businesses and our communities won't be able to function.

The whole reason we are talking about any of this is because we have the impending challenge of climate change that is already upon us today. In order to reduce the effects of climate change, we have to reduce our use of oil and gas, and we have to make sure that the pollution, as we are talking about in this bill, isn't impacting our communities.

It is interesting, my colleague mentioned that in the airport he sees people traveling to and from work in this area. Is it possible that crowd of people don't want to live in this area because the pollution and the effects are too strong and they would prefer just to go to work and get home to breathe some clean air somewhere else?

My colleague assumes that if we don't continue at the level we are operating on that we will be buying oil from Iran or China or Russia. He seems to forget that we have a booming industry going on in green energy. Whether it is renewable solar or wind or many of the other innovations that are taking place right now, they are far outpacing our use of oil and gas. In many States, the green energy jobs and the innovation are where all of the economic development and activity is.

For him to say this is our only opportunity or this is all because some of us hate oil and gas or want to penalize people for this, it is absolutely wrong. We are merely trying to bring our country into this modern era and make sure that we are investing in energy. I don't hate energy. I believe in renewable energy, and I believe there are tremendous opportunities out there.

I also want to make sure that communities that are impacted by the pollution, as we are talking about here, are protected, that those communities have the right to breathe clean air as we all hope we can do.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ACTIVITIES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for environmental justice activities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits any of the funding from being used to carry out environmental justice activities.

Let me explain this to you. Environmental justice is nothing more than the synthesis of divisive racial ideology and radical environmentalism in the same package. This entire ideology is based on the notion that Federal environmental funding should be allocated based on immutable characteristics.

Biden's Justice40 Initiative directs 40 percent of Federal clean energy and energy efficiency spending based on ethnicity, migrant status, and income status.

How is that fair in America? I don't hear anything about the fact that poor communities are hurt the hardest by this administration's inflationary energy policy.

Just last year, the Census Bureau found that 36 percent of consumers say it has been somewhat to very difficult for them to pay their usual bills in the last 7 days. That is a 25 percent increase from the prior year. I hear it in my own district.

Environmental justice is just another way for this administration to funnel dollars, your tax dollars, to radical leftwing groups, including anti-Israel groups. I think that is important to note today.

In December of 2023, the Biden administration announced it would award \$600 million in environmental justice funding. Fifty million dollars went to the Climate Justice Alliance, which organized anti-Israel protests in the Capitol rotunda last year.

What does any of that have to do with the environment?

Climate Justice Alliance's website has a "Free Palestine" web page that states: "The path to climate justice travels through a free Palestine. . . ."

I am sorry. I don't see the nexus.

Will my Democrat colleagues vote to send money to these groups, Iran's useful idiots, by opposing this amendment on the day that the Prime Minister of Israel came and addressed a joint session? I sure hope not.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, in recent years, Democrats have made historic investments in environmental justice, and the EPA has already put those dollars to good use.

It is unfortunate that my colleagues across the aisle continue to attack good government programs. Environmental justice ensures that all Americans receive the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards, which is particularly important in rural communities, many of which are in the very districts of my colleagues across the aisle and myself.

Rural communities and low-income communities have long been targeted by corporations, regulatory agencies, and local planning and zoning boards when siting polluting facilities. This includes things like landfills, waste transfer stations, incinerators, garbage dumps, diesel bus and truck garages, auto body shops, smokestack industries, industrial hog and chicken processors, oil refineries, chemical manufacturers, and radioactive waste storage areas.

Because of this, these communities typically have lower property values, higher health disparities, and shorter lifespans.

Why would my colleagues try to defund any effort to improve the lives of people in rural and low-income communities? It is yet another attempt to implement an extreme agenda, to attack minority groups at all costs, and to return the United States to a time when environmental discrimination was the norm.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support our rural and our low-income communities by rejecting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I don't know about all Americans. As a matter of fact, many of the communities that I represent are lower income. They are struggling to pay their electricity bills, and I doubt that they have gotten \$50 million or part of what the Climate Justice Alliance got.

Most of my constituents don't have time to run around protesting with "Free Palestine" signs the day that the Prime Minister of Israel was addressing Congress.

I will tell you this. Justice should not be based on ethnicity, migrant status, or income status. Justice should be blind in America. Unfortunately, we have gotten away from that, and this is funding it.

I suggest that we all vote in favor of this and have justice be blind and have all Americans and all citizens treated equally.

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

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 88 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 120, line 11, strike “wildfire” and insert “wildfire, search and rescue.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, amendment No. 88 to H.R. 8998 will ensure States and other cooperating entities that provide search-and-rescue services on Federal lands can receive reimbursement.

In northern Minnesota, the St. Louis County Rescue Squad assists people lost or injured in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, which is Federal land in my district.

According to a Duluth News Tribune article, the squad’s reported budget is about \$450,000 per year. However, with the roughly 30,000 hours volunteer members dedicate to the cause each year, it is estimated that the squad provides about \$3.5 million in free labor annually.

Recently, tragedy struck the BWCA. Two canoeists, Jesse Haugen of Cambridge and Reis Grams of Lino Lakes, fell over Curtain Falls. The St. Louis County Rescue Squad spent over 2 weeks on a search-and-rescue mission looking for these two individuals before they located their bodies. May these two souls rest in peace.

Of the 95 members of the St. Louis County Rescue Squad, 61 took part in the Curtain Falls mission. Combined, they worked almost 6,000 hours.

During a recent meeting I had with Squad Captain Rick Slatten, he estimated that the cost of the mission was around \$150,000, over a quarter of their annual budget on one call.

As a former law enforcement officer, I know that rescue squads are critical to ensuring the safety of the constituencies and the many tourists that visit each year.

During a search-and-rescue mission, every second counts, and we need these crews to have the resources necessary to stay on top of their game or at a minimum know that they have the backing of the Federal Government to do what they can to save lives.

As the bill currently reads: The wildland fire management account can be used to reimburse States and other cooperating agencies for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters.

This amendment simply clarifies that search and rescue is a part of that reimbursement category. This will ensure that our search-and-rescue squads can continue to conduct these vital services in our communities.

Search-and-rescue volunteer rescue squads from small townships and small cities across America enter our Federal lands to rescue people that are in our

Federal lands for enjoyment. It costs a lot of money to keep up equipment. It costs a lot of time and training, and these dollars will recognize them by saying that their rescue efforts are important to all of us.

Mr. Chair, I ask that this amendment be made in order, and I ask Members to be in support on the floor. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the spending reduction account), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to designate the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, or any portion thereof, as a national monument under chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Antiquities Act of 1906”).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment that prohibits any funds from being used to designate the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness located within the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota as a national monument under the Antiquities Act.

The Superior National Forest is a working industrial forest, and it should always remain one. Responsible mining and responsible timber harvesting are desired traits of the forest. Mining and timber harvesting are part of our way of life in northern Minnesota, and they exist hand in hand with recreation and conservation.

This amendment protects our way of life and protects against an activist administration here in Washington taking steps to change it. In December 2016, while they were on their way out of office, the Obama-Biden administration made a last-minute Antiquities Act designation for Bears Ears in southeastern Utah. The amendment before you today is an insurance policy to ensure that the Biden-Harris administration doesn’t make a last-ditch effort to do the same and designate a new monument in northern Minnesota which would jeopardize desired responsible use of the Superior National Forest, again, a working industrial forest.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will likely

argue, this amendment will not jeopardize any existing protections that the wilderness area already enjoys. This amendment does not expand mining or timber harvesting into the Boundary Waters. This amendment ensures we can continue to mine and harvest timber outside of the Boundary Waters.

Let me be clear. Mining will never take place in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. That has been settled since 1978 when Congress passed the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act. Back in 1978, my predecessor, then-Representative of the Eighth Congressional District, Democrat Jim Oberstar, stood here on the House floor and argued that our ability to responsibly mine and harvest timber in the Superior National Forest shall never be infringed.

This amendment is quite simple. It simply reaffirms Congress’ intent when the 1978 wilderness act was passed. It simply protects against overreach from the executive branch, and, most importantly, it protects our way of life in northern Minnesota.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, my colleague from Minnesota has offered an amendment which doesn’t make sense. I will explain why, Mr. Chairman. The amendment is directed at the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, but there is a fundamental misunderstanding of what is wilderness and how it is designated, what happens in the Superior National Forest, and the way this amendment is drafted.

First, the amendment would prohibit the administration from designating the BWCA as a national monument. When the Antiquities Act was passed by Congress to give the President the ability to protect vulnerable lands that contain valuable scientific, cultural, and historic resources, the BWCA was already protected.

Wilderness, Mr. Chair, is the most protected and restricted designation we have for public lands. The level of wilderness that it affords far exceeds what the national monument designation offer is. What I think the Member is attempting to do, and I might disagree with him but he has the right to do it, would be to leave out the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness Area and just talk about the Superior National Forest which is not part of that wilderness area, and then his amendment would make sense. I wouldn’t support it, but his amendment would make sense.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my good friend and colleague from Minnesota’s comments. I will tell

you that in 2016 on their way out the Obama-Biden administration, for purely political reasons, pulled mining leases for a company that wanted to mine critical minerals in northeastern Minnesota. The Biden-Harris administration went against the Supreme Court when the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional to pay off student loans, and they still did it.

What this says, Mr. Chair, is as the Biden-Harris administration is in their waning days here, they can't diminish our opportunities in northeastern Minnesota, period.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as I said, the gentleman from Minnesota from the Eighth Congressional District and I might disagree on some of those things. I can't, in good conscience, support this amendment because it is not drafted in a way that would even do what the gentleman would like to do. It is just written wrong.

The Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area is protected. It is wilderness. Any portion thereafter that is in the amendment would be parts that are not part of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area. So by having that in the amendment, the amendment is not drafted properly.

For that and other reasons, I just close with this: I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. We look forward to, in the future, having this discussion maybe next year with an amendment which the gentleman and I could disagree on the principle and not the way it is drafted.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, again, I do not trust the Biden-Harris administration on their way out. I do not trust them on their way out. This will ensure that the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness remains as it is and there are no antiquities put forth. I do not trust the Biden-Harris administration when it comes to mining. They are the most anti-mining administration in the history of the United States of America. They haven't opened one mine.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to expand the

area designated as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness by section 3 of Public Law 95-495.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment that prohibits any funds from being used to expand the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness Area within the Superior National Forest in northern Minnesota.

Mining and timber harvesting have played a significant role in the culture and the economy of northern Minnesota for well over a century. Mining and timber harvesting are our past, our present, and our future in northern Minnesota. We have proven we can mine and harvest timber responsibly all while still protecting and enjoying the beautiful area that we call home.

Antimining and antife forestry activists in this administration have taken step after step to attack our way of life in Minnesota. As my colleagues in this Chamber have heard me discuss time and time again, the Biden-Harris administration have used every tool to ban mining in northern Minnesota. They pulled the long-held leases for the Twin Metals project where copper was to be mined responsibly. Then they went even further and put into place a 20-year mineral withdrawal banning mining on 225,504 acres in the working industrial Superior National Forest.

What is next, Mr. Chairman?

What will they do next to attack our way of life and further stop mining in northern Minnesota?

My amendment will prevent the Biden-Harris administration from expanding the wilderness area while they are on their way out of the door later this year.

Just like my last amendment, this amendment does nothing to jeopardize existing protections for the Boundary Waters. This amendment does not expand mining or timber harvesting into the Boundary Waters. It simply ensures our ability to responsibly mine and harvest timber outside of the Boundary Waters. This amendment simply ensures this administration or any future administration cannot further attack our way of life in northeastern Minnesota.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment, unfortunately, like the last one, is flawed. In fact, in my opinion, it is not even relevant. It prohibits the administration from using funds to expand the Boundary Waters wilderness.

I want to be clear. The executive branch cannot expand wilderness, period. They can't. Only an act of Congress, only we can expand wilderness. Unless Republican House leadership is planning on bringing a bill to the floor to expand the BWCA wilderness boundaries or a bill allowing the administration to unilaterally designate public lands as wilderness area, this amendment makes no sense.

Like the past amendment, this amendment is directed at the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area. Unfortunately, they betray a fundamental understanding of what wilderness is and how it is designated.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, we have to remember that as we speak, the U.S. Forest Service is looking to purchase 70,000 acres of the wilderness from the school trust fund. They are looking to expand the wilderness as we speak.

Again, what this does is it ensures that the Biden-Harris administration on their way out doesn't do anything to expand the wilderness area.

My good friend and colleague from Minnesota says that the executive branch can't. They will try, and what this does, Mr. Chairman, is it ensures them not even considering it because it is part of legislation now.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the school public trust lands that are being purchased are not being purchased to be put into wilderness. They can't be. The Forest Service can purchase them, and the county can purchase them if they are up for sale. The State of Minnesota has a say in it. I served in the State house. However, the Biden-Harris administration cannot—cannot—even if purchased designate them as wilderness unless we, as the Congress, the House and Senate, vote affirmatively to do so and then send a bill to the President's desk.

I understand the passion. It is clear that my colleague, the gentleman from the Eighth Congressional District, and I have different points of view on the BWCA and its protection of this pristine water up there, but these two amendments just bring the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness Area into a political fight that it doesn't belong in because the amendments are not drafted properly.

Mr. Chair, I am probably ready to close, but I am going to reserve the balance of my time for now.

□ 1700

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I offered three amendments. In the last two, I think I have said maybe three or four times now that as the Biden-Harris administration exits at the end of this year, I don't trust what they are going to do to our wilderness area, our mining, and our timber harvesting. They have proven it. The Obama-Biden administration took a

run at northeastern Minnesota when they pulled the leases on their way out.

What this does, Mr. Chair, is ensures that this blocks them from the attempt. This blocks them from the attempt to devastate northeastern Minnesota more so than they have already done.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do, but the way this is drafted doesn't do it.

I want my colleagues to think hard about amendments that fundamentally represent the laws that govern wilderness areas, including the Boundary Waters.

I hear you loud and clear that you don't agree with decisions made by this current administration, but the decisions that you are talking about into the future are not part of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Canoe Area.

Mr. Chair, for that reason, I reject this amendment because it is technically flawed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The salary of Brenda Mallory, Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer my amendment No. 91 to reduce the salary of Council on Environmental Quality, CEQ, Chair Brenda Mallory to \$1.

Mr. Chair, I have spoken numerous times on this floor about the dangerous rule proposed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation Council, the FAR Council, titled: "Federal Acquisition Regulation: Disclosure of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate-Related Financial Risk."

This disastrous rule proposed by the FAR Council has numerous constitutional, national security, and practical concerns, none of which have been adequately addressed by the FAR Council. However, as part of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee's ongoing

investigation into the basis for this rule, it was uncovered that the CEQ, which does not possess rulemaking abilities, pushed the FAR Council to implement its radical agenda and publish this rule.

First and foremost, this rule requires that all Federal contractors that do business worth more than \$50 million with the Federal Government must disclose scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions.

This rule also seeks to require major Federal contractors to comply with the Paris climate accords, which have never even been ratified by the Senate.

The most objectionable part of this rule is the requirement that companies set climate targets and then have them validated by one specifically named company called Science Based Targets initiative, or SBTi. SBTi is a non-American, foreign, London-based company, which inherently carries national security concerns.

Under this rule, every major Federal contractor, including companies critical to our national security and our defense industrial base, would have to provide this foreign-owned company with information about all of their scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and then strategize on how to reduce them.

Despite the existence of numerous American-based companies that could fill the same role, the FAR Council and CEQ chose a foreign company as the sole source provider because SBTi is nothing but a front for Democratic donors and advocacy groups.

SBTi is owned by the We Mean Business Coalition, which is a project of the New Venture Fund, which is managed by the dark-money super-PAC known as Arabella Advisors. Arabella Advisors, for those who don't know, is the George Soros-funded leftwing advocacy group that funnels dark money into leftwing causes and candidates.

To summarize, the Biden administration has named a subsidiary of one of their top donors, a leftwing, dark-money organization, as the sole source provider for all climate target validating for all major Federal Government contractors.

During a hearing in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee on this rule, even the Democratic witness said that SBTi was a poor choice for this role, yet CEQ and the FAR Council forged ahead anyway.

No Federal bureaucrat should be mandating that companies funnel money into the Democrats' dark-money operations. This is the very definition of corruption.

As the head of CEQ, Brenda Mallory played an integral role in pushing for this rule. Her salary must be defunded.

I look forward to working with Chairman LUCAS, Chairman OBERNOLTE, and all of my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to expose the corruption behind this proposed rule and halt its finalization and implementation.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MS. TENNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Executive Order 14019 (863 Fed. Reg. 13623; relating to promoting access to voting), except for sections 7, 8, and 10 of such Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment No. 92 to the Interior appropriations bill to prohibit funding for President Biden's Executive Order No. 14019, titled: "Executive Order on Promoting Access to Voting."

This order requires Federal agencies to use their power, influence, resources, and Federal funding to enter into agreements with nongovernmental organizations to conduct voter registration and other mobilization activities.

Mr. Chair, this executive order is nothing but a blatant attempt to transform the Federal Government into a partisan get-out-the-vote machine for Democrats. The Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency should be completely nonpartisan and should not be using taxpayer funds and resources to actively engage in get-out-the-vote operations that have nothing to do with the departments' core missions, not to mention the obvious mission creep and Hatch Act violations that this activity triggers.

Mr. Chair, President Biden should not be weaponizing Federal agencies

and the Federal Government, using American taxpayer dollars to manipulate and steer our elections in a partisan manner.

Let me be clear. The Department of the Interior is actively carrying out Executive Order No. 14019. The Heritage Foundation has subpoenaed numerous documents and emails related to the Department of the Interior's implementation of this radical executive order, including this interim plan, which, for the record, is fully redacted. Mr. Chair, I wonder why the Department would fully redact this plan if it had nothing to hide.

As the cofounder and chair of the Election Integrity Caucus, it is my privilege to introduce this amendment to restore transparency and confidence in our democratic process while keeping partisan Federal bureaucrats and the swamp, literally, from deliberately tipping the balance at the ballot box.

I stand firmly behind the concept of one citizen, one vote, as enshrined in our Constitution. However, I do not support this blatantly partisan mobilization of the Federal Government for political purposes.

The funds appropriated in this bill should be used as intended, such as to protect public lands for hunting and fishing, not implementing a partisan get-out-the-vote initiative using Federal dollars and Federal employees.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, which will preserve election integrity and stop the Biden administration from transforming the Department of the Interior into a get-out-the-vote, partisan machine for the Democrats.

Let's make voting great again.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chair, the right to vote is a foundation of American democracy. Free and fair elections are a hallmark of our country, and all Americans should have the opportunity to exercise their right to vote without confronting obstacles.

The laws of the United States prohibit racial discrimination, but we are aware of instances where Americans in certain communities are confronted with long lines at the polls or barriers to their participation. I am disappointed that my colleague would want to restrict funding for this executive order that strives to make voter registration easier, expand access to information, and make voting more accessible.

My colleagues across the aisle talk about protecting First Amendment and Second Amendment rights, yet Republicans would prohibit funding for efforts to ensure the basic democratic right for every American to vote.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Chair, I respectfully disagree with my colleague's interpretation of this bill.

I can't think of anything worse than having people who are on an important mission working in the Department of the Interior or other agencies engage in partisan get-out-the-vote efforts, being at the polls, and helping people vote.

That is not their job. That is the job of the States. Each one of the States is required under law to make sure to administer our elections, to be sure that we have one citizen, one vote, and that we have free and fair elections and access to voting. That is not the job of the Federal Government. In fact, Federal employees are prohibited from this kind of illegal activity under the Hatch Act.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and prohibit our dollars and our employees from being forced to engage in partisanship at the ballot box instead of working on keeping our communities safe and keeping our environment free from some of the interference that we are seeing from the Biden administration.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. TIFFANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in part B of House Report 118-602.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 117, beginning on line 14, strike "roads that are no longer needed, including".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1370, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chair, my amendment strikes funding in the bill to close existing Forest Service roads. Maintaining and expanding access to our public lands has been a priority for me and many of my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee this Congress.

Another lesser-known but equally important threat to access is the closure and decommissioning of roads and trails. Since 1991, the Forest Service has decommissioned an average of 2,000 miles of roads per year. Public lands across the Nation are under threat from big-city environmental groups that are hellbent on restricting public access to our shared public lands.

Shutting down these avenues for access doesn't just limit opportunities for recreational opportunities, like hunt-

ing, fishing, and ATVing, but it also makes responsible management efforts more difficult and expensive. That is exactly their goal.

My subcommittee saw these road closures firsthand in the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest in my district during a field hearing in May. It is not a coincidence that many of these local road closures correlate with the decline in the local forest products industry, the same industry that helps keep our forests and the communities that depend on them healthy and vibrant.

Forest Service roads can also act as an important firebreak for wildfires and allow quicker access for fighting them.

The language of decommissioning roads that are no longer needed is quite vague. In my experience, the Forest Service has not been very good about coordinating with local communities before closing roads that many people use.

□ 1715

Mr. Chair, why are we spending tax dollars to close roads we spent tax money to build?

It makes no sense.

Let's make a U-turn on the harmful policy and stop throwing up roadblocks that make it more difficult for Americans to visit these special places. I ask for a "yes" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would be detrimental to the Forest Service's ability to maintain quality fisheries and safe public drinking water.

Decommissioning of roads is a critical tool in the management of the National Forest System that allows the service to remove roads that are no longer necessary and are likely to cause resource damages to the local watershed affecting fish habitat and water quality.

Decommissioning is used judiciously within the National Forest System, and it is necessary for the Forest Service to ensure that the removal of the road will have little to no impact to public access or fire suppression. Often, when one road is decommissioned, another existing road is identified as the alternative access to the local area which allows access to be maintained. This is an unnecessary amendment.

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

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Chair, I wish the gentlewoman would have been with us on our tour in May in northern Wisconsin. She would have heard from local people, local elected officials, State elected officials, and others who are harmed by these road closures that are happening.

The waste of tax dollars is very significant. We saw perfectly fine roads

that had been constructed to do logging projects and then they were removed.

We heard from a couple of elderly ladies who are berry pickers, which is a favorite pastime of many people up in northern Wisconsin at this time of year. They used to go out there and be able to pick berries now and then. They can no longer do that.

This is denying access to the very people who want to use our public lands that are taken care of with their tax dollars. There is no reason to close these roads. These roads have been active, oftentimes for decades, with no problems, and it is not rational to use the argument that this is going to harm the watershed.

If you come to some of the areas that we toured on our trip in May, you will see some of the finest waters that you will find in northern Wisconsin, and they were that way when these roads were active. There is no reason that we should be closing and decommissioning these roads.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8998) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

ESTABLISHING THE TASK FORCE ON THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF DONALD J. TRUMP

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 1367) establishing the Task Force on the Attempted Assassination of Donald J. Trump, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1367

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT; COMPOSITION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the House of Representatives the Task Force on the Attempted Assassination of Donald J. Trump (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall be composed of not more than 13 Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner appointed by the Speaker, not more than 6 of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader. The Speaker shall designate one member of the Task Force as its chair. A vacancy in the membership of the Task Force shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(2) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The Speaker and the minority leader shall be ex officio members of the Task Force but shall have no vote in the Task Force and may not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(3) DESIGNATION OF LEADERSHIP STAFF MEMBER.—The Speaker and the minority leader each may designate a leadership staff member to assist in their capacity as ex officio members, with the same access to Task Force meetings, hearings, briefings, and materials as employees of the Task Force and subject to the same security clearance and confidentiality requirements as employees of the Task Force, or as required to conduct the functions of the Task Force.

SEC. 2. JURISDICTION; FUNCTIONS.

(a) FUNCTIONS.—The functions of the Task Force shall be to—

(1) investigate and fully examine all actions by any agency, Department, officer, or employee of the Federal Government, as well as State and local law enforcement or any other State or local government or private entities or individuals, related to the attempted assassination of Donald J. Trump on July 13, 2024 in Butler, Pennsylvania; and

(2) issue a final report of its findings to the House not later than December 13, 2024, including any recommendations for legislative reforms necessary to prevent future security lapses.

(b) INTERIM REPORTS.—In addition to any final report addressing the matters described in subsection (a), the Task Force may issue such interim reports as it deems necessary.

(c) UNCLASSIFIED FORM.—Any report issued by the Task Force shall be issued in unclassified form but may include a classified annex, a law enforcement-sensitive annex, or both.

SEC. 3. PROCEDURE.

(a) Notwithstanding clause 3(m) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Task Force is authorized to study the sources and methods of entities described in clause 11(b)(1)(A) of rule X insofar as such study is related to the matters described in section 2.

(b) Clause 11(b)(4), clause 11(e), and the first sentence of clause 11(f) of rule X shall apply to the Task Force.

(c) Except as specified in subsection (d), the Task Force shall have the authorities and responsibilities of, and shall be subject to the same limitations and restrictions as, a standing committee of the House, and shall be deemed a committee of the House for all purposes of law or rule.

(d)(1) Rules X and XI shall apply to the Task Force where not inconsistent with this subsection.

(2) Service on the Task Force shall not count against the limitations in clause 5(b)(2) of rule X.

(3) Clause 2(a) of rule XI shall not apply to the Task Force.

(4) Clause 2(g)(2)(D) of rule XI shall apply to the Task Force in the same manner as it applies to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(5) Pursuant to clause 2(h) of rule XI, two members of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence and one-third of the members of the Task Force shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than one for which the presence of a majority of the Task Force is required.

(6) The chair of the Task Force, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may authorize and issue subpoenas pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI in the investigation and study conducted pursuant to section 2, including for the purpose of taking depositions.

(7)(A) The chair of the Task Force, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may order the taking of depositions, including pursuant to subpoena, by a member or counsel of the Task Force, in the same manner as a standing committee pursuant to section 3(k)(1) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Eighteenth Congress.

(B) Depositions taken under the authority prescribed in this paragraph shall be governed by the procedures submitted by the chair of the Committee on Rules for printing in the Congressional Record on January 10, 2023.

(8) Subpoenas authorized pursuant to this resolution may be signed by the chair of the Task Force or a designee.

(9) The chair of the Task Force may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, recognize—

(A) members of the Task Force to question a witness for periods longer than five minutes as though pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(B) of rule XI; and

(B) staff of the Task Force to question a witness as though pursuant to clause 2(j)(2)(C) of rule XI.

(10) The chair of the Task Force may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on questions referenced in clause 2(h)(4) of rule XI, and may resume proceedings on such postponed questions at any time after reasonable notice. Notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(11) The provisions of paragraphs (f)(1) through (f)(12) of clause 4 of rule XI shall apply to the Task Force.

SEC. 4. RECORDS; STAFF; TRAVEL; FUNDING.

(a) Any committee of the House of Representatives having custody of records in any form relating to the matters described in section 2 shall transfer such records to the Task Force within 7 days of the adoption of this resolution. Such records shall become the records of the Task Force.

(b) The appointment and the compensation of staff for the Task Force shall be subject to regulations issued by the Committee on House Administration.

(c)(1) Staff of employing entities of the House or a joint committee may be detailed to the Task Force to carry out this resolution and shall be deemed to be staff of the Task Force.

(2) The Task Force may request the head of any Federal agency to detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Task Force.

(d) Section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)) shall apply with respect to the Task Force in the same manner as such section applies with respect to a standing committee, except that