

assistance should never be tethered to a hyperpartisan, domestic financial concession.

The offset in this bill, slashing IRS staff, actually adds to the deficit and would allow billionaires to get away with cheating on their taxes.

In matters of foreign policy, especially with crucial allies like Israel, we must rise above partisan politics.

When a bipartisan supplemental appropriations bill containing aid for Israel comes back from the Senate without poison pills, I will wholeheartedly support it. That is the clear path forward here and the best way to support our friend and ally, Israel.

#### CALIFORNIA WATER IS IMPORTANT FOR THE NATION'S FOOD SUPPLY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out that, once again, our water situation in California is extremely important to the whole country for our food supply.

Like these products you see here, many, many crops that are grown in California supply 90 to 99 percent of what Americans will consume; otherwise, they would be imported.

Why is that important? Because if our water supply in California isn't allowed to go to agriculture, instead more and more environmental water, more and more water just allowed to flow down the streams without being captured in water storage, we don't get these crops, we don't have an economy, and the land turns into something much less productive.

What we need is to continue to focus on saving water in California and allowing it to flow to agriculture, more water storage projects, and updating the 1960s-1970s manuals that guide how government saves water.

Yes, we had an amazing amount of water last year, but still two of our large reservoirs only reached 50 percent and 80 percent full, even with all that. Water management is extremely important when we manage it for people.

□ 0915

#### FOCUS ON BOTH WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION

(Mr. Robert GARCIA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Robert GARCIA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about our country suffering from an epidemic that is devastating our communities and tearing apart families.

Last week, a lone gunman walked into a bowling alley and opened fire on children and parents who were there for a children's bowling league. He got into his car, drove to a nearby restaurant, and senselessly murdered eight more.

This is now a common occurrence in America, and it needs to stop.

Yesterday, I proudly introduced the AMMO Act with Senator ELIZABETH WARREN. Our country has more guns on the street than people. If we are going to truly solve gun violence, we must focus on not just weapons but also on ammunition. That means addressing how we license, sell, and regulate ammo.

In many parts of the country, it is easier to buy ammunition than it is to register to vote. In most of the country, you can walk into a convenience store or pharmacy and purchase as much ammunition as you want without ever showing any ID.

The AMMO Act requires licensing to sell ammo, enacts background checks, cracks down on straw purchasing, restricts bulk sales, and institutes recordkeeping and data sharing across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the AMMO Act will save lives. It is time to act.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CISCOMANI). Pursuant to House Resolution 838 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. 4821.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) kindly take the chair.

□ 0916

#### 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. 4821) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Thursday, November 2, 2023, amendment No. 125, printed in part A of House Report 118-261, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE), had been disposed of.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 126 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. ROY. 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 for environmental justice activities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering here on the legislation we are considering would prohibit any of the funds in this appropriations bill from being used to carry out so-called environmental justice activities.

This so-called environmental justice is nothing more, in the end, than a synthesis of divisive racial ideology and policies that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to promote with radical environmentalism.

Basically, they are taking the radical environmental policies perpetuated in the EPA and Interior through this administration, doubling down on them, injecting divisive race policies, and now creating a larger problem for the American people.

The entire ideology is based on the notion that Federal environmental funding should be allocated based on immutable characteristics. Let's think about that for a minute. Not only do we need to destroy the American economy with radical environmental policies, but we need to inject divisive race policies in the middle of it. That is where we are.

People are running around, going to the gas station to get gasoline. They are trying to power their homes. They are wondering why we are having massive instability around the world. They wonder why China is on the rise. They wonder why Iran is able to enrich itself by selling oil to China. They wonder why they can't afford to live their own lives while inflation is destroying their well-being. Now, we are injecting race into the middle of it all.

Biden's so-called Justice40 Initiative directs 40 percent of Federal clean energy and energy efficiency spending based on ethnicity, migrant status, and income status. You literally just can't make up this absurdity.

Here are some of the examples.

"Developing a roadmap to dismantle environmental racism" in Brunswick, Georgia.

Ecology Action in Bloomington, Illinois, "seeks to identify and develop mitigation strategies for disproportionate climate impacts . . . and increase tree equity." What in the hell is tree equity?

Supporting summer high school environmental internships in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, "to build climate resilience and connect mainly young people of color to life skills and environmental sector career pathways." However, a recent study conducted by President Obama's former Energy Secretary found, on average, solar workers make \$12,000 a year less than oil and gas workers.

The fact of the matter is that we are destroying the American economy by chasing the climate agenda, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fully acknowledge and admit is being

driven by the climate agenda and that the American people must suffer higher inflation and higher costs—an inability to afford their own homes and their own cars to go about their own jobs and their own way of life—in order to pursue an agenda that everybody acknowledges that, even if we do everything my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we should do, wouldn't dent CO<sub>2</sub> production relative to what is happening in China, India, and countries around the world.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, in recent years, Democrats have made historic investments in environmental justice, and the EPA has already put those dollars to good use. I think it is unfortunate that my colleagues across the aisle continue to attack good government programs.

Environmental justice, just to explain this, ensures that all Americans receive the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards. It is particularly important in rural communities, like the one I represent and like the one I imagine my colleague represents. Many of these rural communities are in the very districts my colleagues across the aisle are representing.

Rural communities and low-income communities have long been targeted by corporations, regulatory agencies, and local planning and zoning boards when siting polluting facilities.

Let me give you a list of the kinds of things we are talking about here: 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. We are not talking about something trivial here. We are talking about serious concerns about your health, the length of your life, and what your property is worth.

Why would my colleagues try to defund any effort to improve the lives of people in rural and low-income communities?

I am sorry, but it is just another attempt to implement an extreme agenda to attack minority groups at all costs and to return to a time when environmental discrimination was the norm.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, the fact is, I have not heard one constituent—not one constituent among the 750,000 people who I represent—come up to me

and say: Do you know what I need, Congressman Roy? I need environmental justice funding.

Calls to my office are just begging for environmental justice funding. Has anybody had a constituent do that, call up and say: Will you please solve the world's problems with environmental justice funding? No.

Do you know what I have had? I have had phone calls to my office saying: I can't afford gas. I can't afford electricity.

I have had calls from workers from a refinery in my district saying that they are going to drive us out of business and that they don't know what they are going to do.

That is all a direct result of a radical agenda by Democrats in the White House, the administration, and my colleagues across the aisle in this Chamber and the other Chamber who are more interested in advancing a radical agenda than standing up for American citizens who simply want to live their lives.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a straightforward amendment. It would do what the American people want us to do, which is focus on our job here in this Chamber to deliver our constitutional duties and nothing more and not divide us by race while also destroying the American economy with radical environmentalism.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the other side of the aisle said no one ever calls his office and talks about environmental justice. I understand. There are all kinds of words we use in Congress that people rarely talk to us about. They don't talk to us about many of the procedures that we have on the floor, all kinds of things that we do.

However, you do have people who call your office to say: Do you know what? I don't want that chemical manufacturer sited next to my house. I am worried about that hog farm that is coming down the road from me. I am worried about the garbage dump. I am worried about the health impacts that my family is experiencing because of where we live.

Maybe that didn't happen in your district. I will admit that everything doesn't happen in all of our districts, but there are certainly districts across the country where people are experiencing adverse health impacts. They are experiencing loss of property values because things have been sited in their neighborhood.

Maybe my colleague, like so many times here in Congress, just doesn't like the words. I understand. I have heard the term "environmental justice" so many times over the last couple of days, as if it is some kind of a discriminatory term, or as if it is some

kind of term that they just can't get out of their mouth without feeling angry.

We can call it anything we want. We can call it poor siting of messy places. We can call it anything my colleagues want. To make sure that all Americans get a fair deal and that people don't have adverse health impacts, I am willing to change that, just like we can't say "climate change" without people getting upset.

I am happy, every time we have to discuss this, just to say "extreme weather." Okay, it is extreme weather. It is too much melting. It is too much heat. Too much of things that aren't supposed to happen and going wrong—the hottest summer on record, melting of the polar ice cap, and people who live in communities like mine experiencing the greatest heat in the ocean of any oceans on Earth.

These are things that are impacting all of us. I will call it whatever my colleagues like, but we have to do something about it. We have to have equity here, and we have to make sure it is a fair deal for everybody.

I heard you didn't like the term "tree equity." I get it. It is one of those things that you just think: What are we talking about now?

In fact, urban areas have changed. I am so fortunate that I live in the most forested State in the Nation. I don't know what it is like where my colleague lives. If my colleague lives on top of a hill, maybe there are some trees up there. It makes a huge difference if you are in a part of the city that has trees, if your playgrounds are paved and black and hot in the summer, or if your playgrounds have some trees and shade and some cover so kids can go out and play. We are just talking about kids being able to play on the playground and having a decent life.

When we are talking about making sure we plant trees, which often my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say is a really good idea, we go ahead and believe we should plant more trees.

Let's not get caught up in the terminology. I think there is a lot we could work on together here and that we believe in together. This amendment to disregard all funding for environmental justice—tell me what you want to call it—that is just not appropriate and is not how we should be funding our environmental laws and not how we should be dealing with climate change.

Mr. Chair, I 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 Texas (Mr. ROY).

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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 127 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. ROY. 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 appropriated by this Act may be used to implement any of the following executive orders:

(1) Executive Order 13990, relating to Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis.

(2) Executive Order 14008, relating to Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad.

(3) Section 6 of Executive Order 14013, relating to Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.

(4) Executive Order 14030, relating to Climate-Related Financial Risk.

(5) Executive Order 14057, relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.

(6) Executive Order 14082, relating to Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

(7) Executive Order 14096, relating to Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, before I talk about this amendment, the gentleman referred to the importance of having trees. No one disagrees with that. Yes, I live in the Texas Hill Country, where live oaks are something we try to figure out how to protect, especially, for example, when you have an ice storm like earlier this year. You are out there figuring out a way to go save your trees by cutting limbs and figuring out how to preserve the beauty that God gave us. Nobody disagrees with that.

□ 0930

Nonetheless, the idea that a core responsibility of the Federal Government is tree equity is absurd. The State of Texas is the eighth largest economy in the world. We are perfectly capable of figuring out how to deal with trees.

We don't have any money. We are \$34 trillion in debt, \$2 trillion a year in deficit spending, and we are talking about tree equity?

What the hell are we doing? That is the question here.

I love trees. I love live oak trees. I do everything I can to preserve and protect the environment in which I live because—this is a crazy idea—I live there. I actually like to fish, and I like to live in clean air and clean water. I like to have an environment that is

great to be in for my kids and my family.

We had a Clean Water Act and a Clean Air Act in Texas before the Environmental Protection Agency was even created here in this town.

The fact of the matter is we can do what we need to do to protect our communities without this place spending money we don't have to interfere with this. Yes, there are interstate issues we must deal with, and we can deal with those things. Nevertheless, the fact is we can do these things.

This amendment that I am offering prohibits any of the funding in the Interior-Environment appropriations bill from being used to carry out President Biden's executive orders on climate change.

These executive orders direct the EPA to wage its regulatory war on the United States energy production and the internal combustion engine. The fact of the matter is there are ambitious efforts to convert our entire fleet of vehicles to have two-thirds of new vehicles be electric vehicles by 2032.

Now, that might sound good in a little focus group in some Ivy League cabal in Boston, but the idea of what this is going to actually do to hard-working Americans is something we ought to actually flush out for the American public when the average EV is \$16,000 more than a vehicle with an internal combustion engine.

Maybe we should talk about the racial justice issues of cobalt miners around the world who are being exploited in the Congo so that we can empower China by buying all of their batteries rather than producing American oil and gas.

If people think that all of this stuff is an accident of what we are seeing unfold in the Middle East and what we are seeing unfold in Ukraine while our prices are going up and while our national security strength is going down because we are pursuing this radical agenda, these things are all connected.

So, yes, we should not be funding these radical executive orders that are destroying the American way of life and making it virtually impossible for people to figure out how to live their lives while we pursue unicorn energy theories that we are going to be able to somehow magically produce power without the use of reliable power.

Texas has tons of wind and solar. That is great, but we also have a grid that is decreasingly reliable directly as a consequence of Federal regulatory impact on our ability to manage our grid. That is wrong, we shouldn't do it, and we shouldn't be funding a continuation of it.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, we are only 14 days away from a government shutdown, and instead of focusing on keep-

ing the government open, we are working on a bill that is going nowhere.

The draconian cuts that are proposed in this bill violate the agreement reached by former Speaker McCarthy and President Biden and that were memorialized in statute in Public Law 118–5, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

We would not be teetering on the brink of a government shutdown if my Republican colleagues had held up their end of the bargain.

Now we are here today to protect the welfare of the American public, and we cannot close our eyes to the impacts of climate change, such as the drought, flooding, severe storms, and wildfire events we are experiencing.

As of October 10, the United States has experienced 24 confirmed weather/climate disaster events with losses exceeding \$1 billion each. This is a new record.

This amendment seeks to prohibit funding that will result in more resilient communities, mitigate the impacts of climate change, and protect our world for future generations.

Not investing in strategies that minimize and prevent the acceleration of climate change and instead spending billions in disaster relief shows my Republican colleagues are not thinking about what is best for the American taxpayer. Our economy, our health, our livelihoods, our food security, and our quality of life all depend on healthy ecosystems.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to focus instead on addressing climate change and on making our Nation stronger, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chair, the fact of the matter is that, yes, this bill returns the funding to the ever-efficient model of effectiveness of the 2018 Federal Government.

Yes, it does back up the funding levels. Frankly, we ought to be doing it for more of our agencies, and we are trying to take those steps forward. I will say that unapologetically because the American people are sick and tired of the Federal Government spending money we don't have to fund agencies that are directly at war with their way of life. That is the truth.

That is why gasoline is \$1 more than it was when Biden took office, despite the fact that the President has completely dumped our Strategic Petroleum Reserve in order to try to preserve political benefits for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is just the simple truth, and everybody knows it.

Yet, we run around here ignoring the reality of what that means for the American people who are trying to get by every single day while the Federal Government is directly at odds with their ability to prosper, earn a living, pay their bills, pay for their energy, pay for their schools, buy cars, and do what they need to do.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, my colleague on the other side of the aisle has proposed this bill that would really slash and burn so many of the important programs that our President has implemented to tackle climate change.

Why did he have to do that?

I have been in Congress for about 15 years, and I am very fortunate to have served that amount of time. But since I came here, I have been dealing with colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have denied that climate change existed, who have done everything they could to support the oil and gas industry, and who have pushed back on any kind of legislation or funding or anything we could possibly do to deal with climate change, and 15 years later we are in a very serious situation.

Now, my colleague is proud of saying that it is a simple truth. It is a simple truth this, it is a simple truth that.

Mr. Chair, let me tell you a simple truth. Our planet is warming. We had the hottest summer on record, oceans are heating. The polar ice cap is melting. We are in a very serious state, and most scientists will say that things are happening much faster than we ever anticipated. Here we are having a ridiculous debate about something that is not actually going to go anywhere and a bill that is not going to happen with a party on the other side of the aisle that wants to cut everything we have already done in the last 2 years to support funding for climate change.

This is our responsibility to our children and our grandchildren. Mr. Chair, you can say that we are just going to handle it in my small town and my small State. I am just going to explain to you that the planet is warming as an entire entity. Yes, we have to deal with foreign countries, but we also have to make sure that our country is on the right track, that we are investing in renewable energy, that we are not putting our heads in the sand and just ignoring what is going on out there, that all of these things are critically important. We have to stop digging in our heels on every single bill and denying that climate change is real and making all kinds of crazy arguments about well, it is India's fault or China's fault or America can't do it.

We can do all these things. We can manufacture the batteries in this country. We can manufacture the solar panels in this country. That is much of what we have done in the last bill, the infrastructure bill, the IRA, investing in our country, and investing in American manufacturing so that this can be homegrown American energy.

Every time the gentleman talks about gas prices, he refuses to acknowledge that we are trying to end our dependence on gas and oil, we are trying to make sure we are an energy-independent nation, and, yes, that takes a transition. Nonetheless, at this moment in time, we have to make those investments in the future.

I have never seen a party so unwilling to invest in our economic future

and to acknowledge what is actually happening in our daily lives and in our families' daily lives.

If the gentleman really listened to his constituents or took their calls or listened to what people are saying about their worries about the future, one of their greatest worries is what are we going to do about the warming planet?

What are we going to do about the number of days when kids can't go outside and play because it is too hot?

What are we going to do about making sure we are looking at our future together?

That is not what the gentleman is doing here. He is just denying that climate change exists. He is denying that we have real work ahead of us and we ought to be doing it together.

Once again, I oppose this horrible amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 128 OFFERED BY MR. SCHWEIKERT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 128 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. 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. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 16 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 128, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, this is actually an amendment that is brutal. It is not a happy place to go, but I am trying to be intellectually honest here.

Every dime we vote on as Members of Congress is now borrowed. Remember, Mr. Chairman, the last fiscal year we borrowed 8.4 percent of GDP. Every dime of military is borrowed; every dime of nondefense is discretionary, which is functionally what we are going over right now, and, what, \$300 billion, \$400 billion of Medicare. For my brothers and sisters on the left, their solution is often: Well, raise revenues.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in this insanity right now where we are bor-

rowing money to send it to entities that have their own taxing authority.

I have been the treasurer of the fourth biggest county in America. I managed the bank, I managed the tax collections, and I managed the finances, or parts of the finances. I understand local government and the burdens there, but we had taxing authority.

Is it rational in a society, particularly with the higher interest rates, for us to borrow and then send the money to entities with their own taxing authority?

Mr. Chair, I understand both on Republicans and Democrats, we despise this because there are lots of things we like. There are things I like that I voted for for years now, but I just look at the math, and I keep wondering: Is it both moral or rational for us to borrow money and send it to entities that have their own taxing authority?

If these programs are so important, which many of them are, there is a solution. Those entities can actually produce the receipts and revenues themselves.

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which cuts programs in this bill by an additional 16 percent, and for not all of these programs do local governments or entities have a taxing authority to pay for them.

The underlying bill provides \$25.4 billion in new nondefense discretionary spending which is \$13.4 billion, 35 percent below the fiscal year 2023 level. The bill also rescinds \$9.4 billion in funding provided to the EPA, The Presidio Trust and the Council on Environmental Quality through Inflation Reduction Act.

In drafting this bill, we worked really hard to rein in Federal spending. One thing that all Republicans agree on is that we have to reduce spending. The debate occurs on how much and how fast.

In drafting this bill, as I said, we worked very hard to rein in Federal spending while prioritizing critical needs within our reduced allocation.

Unfortunately, this is kind of a sledgehammer approach when we just want to reduce the bill across the board by 16 percent.

We would be reducing wildfire fighting. We have done everything we can to protect wildfire fighting, which is devastating, particularly in the West where I live.

We have also done everything we can to protect the Indian Health Service. That is something that is vital here. We don't actually do a very good job of supporting the Indian Health Service overall.

Mr. Chairman, if you look at the amount of money per patient that the

VA spends and the amount that average Americans spend, and then how much we spend per person on the Indian Health Service, it is about one-half of what we spend on other healthcare needs. So we are trying everything we can over the years in a bipartisan way to bring up the Indian Health Service and improve their health, but they don't have a separate taxing authority to be able to do that. That is the Federal Government.

This sledgehammer approach which would just reduce every budget in this bill by 16 percent that is not mandatory spending, I think is inappropriate, and I don't think it is the proper way to go.

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

□ 0945

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I think the chairman actually was generous. I think it is a lot more than a sledgehammer. This is like a small nuclear weapon. Partially that was the point.

Obviously, I care tremendously about IHS and have worked really hard on that. I am just trying to work through this. I want to put this in a moral paradigm. I have my 15-month-old sitting behind me, but this is no longer about the next generation. It is about your own retirement.

We have a math problem. It is a brutal math problem. One more time: We borrow every dime of discretionary; we borrow every dime of military; and now we are actually borrowing hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars of what is mandatory. Some of this breaks my heart, but I don't seem to be able to communicate to my brothers and sisters how ugly the math is.

One more time: As of yesterday, we were borrowing \$78,000 every second. \$78,000 every second. For our friends on the left, they care about this. We care about this. It is just so hard to turn off the faucet.

The very last thing, and then I am going to sit down and shut up and go away. The debt is primarily driven by demographics. It is something we don't tell honestly, but we got old. If you actually look at from today through the next 30 years, 100 percent of the projected debt, 75 percent of it is Medicare, 25 percent if we backfill Social Security in 9 years when the trust fund is empty.

Do you see any of this debate—and I know this is small compared to the scale we are borrowing, but I have to find some way to get people to start understanding the scale of this math because the math always wins. Sometimes it takes a while, but the math will always win.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I sympathize with what the gentleman is saying. I agree with him. It is a huge problem, and it is a math problem. He mentioned something that is really important.

We used to spend about 70 percent of the budget on discretionary spending—that is the money we appropriate through these appropriations bills—and about 30 percent was spent on mandatory spending. That has been reversed, where it is about 70 percent mandatory spending today and only 30 percent in discretionary spending.

Consequently, we have to address mandatory spending. That is difficult to do because anytime you say we have to reform Social Security if we are going to save it, all of a sudden, the commercials are going: Oh, they are going to take away your Social Security.

It is a political football that Republicans and Democrats have to get together and address. That is why the Speaker has said we are going to create a debt commission to look at how we can reduce this debt that we are facing.

I agree with the gentleman. It is horrible what is going on. As I said earlier, the debate is not really whether to cut spending, it is how much and how fast. I guess the gentleman said it best when he called it a small nuclear weapon in this, but I agree with what he is saying in general. It is how we go about it that is the challenge.

Mr. Chair, I 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 Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 129 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

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 implement or enforce the final rule of the Council on Environmental Quality titled “National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions” and published April 20, 2022 (87 Fed. Reg. 23453).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, 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 carry out the Biden administration's NEPA Phase 1 rule.

It is clear we have bipartisan consensus—our permitting system is broken. Our permitting system is holding up projects in every district, whether it is Republican or Democrat, and NEPA deserves a lot of this blame.

When NEPA was first passed in 1969, it was a five-page bill. Over the last 50

years, it has grown out of control thanks to executive actions and activist courts. Today, NEPA is an albatross, blocking everything from highway infrastructure projects that connect communities and enable commerce to energy projects that are necessary for securing our energy independence.

In 2020, the Trump administration enacted the first real NEPA reforms in a generation. It helped bring NEPA back to its original intent. Importantly, the Trump administration's reforms removed the requirement to consider “cumulative impacts,” that go far beyond a proposed project. This prevented opponents of important projects from abusing the NEPA process and pointing to outrageous, distant, so-called cumulative impacts a project could hypothetically pose.

The reforms also forced Federal agencies to build consistency in permitting reviews and ensured all Federal agencies follow the same standards and procedures. These reforms began to point us back in the right direction. The Biden administration's NEPA Phase 1 rule reversed the Trump-era reforms. It reinstated the cumulative impact requirements. It gave free rein back to Federal agencies to put up roadblocks for projects they didn't want.

The Phase 1 rule is just another part of the Biden administration's anywhere but America, any worker but American agenda.

Mr. Chair, the Biden administration's NEPA Phase 1 rule is a step in the wrong direction. It is important that we adopt my amendment and return some sanity to our broken permitting system.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Chair, I believe my colleagues across the aisle fundamentally misunderstand or intentionally misrepresent the interests of energy consumers in the United States and the interests of energy producers.

NEPA is critically important to protect all Americans, but let's run through some statistics. There are currently 2,000 gigawatts of electric generation waiting to be interconnected to the queue in this country. That is more generation than we have by almost a factor of 2. Of those 2,000 gigawatts, there is 1 gigawatt of coal, 85 gigawatts of gas, and every other power plant that is trying to be interconnected to the grid is a zero carbon source of energy. They are not represented by NEPA.

Let's talk about the fossil fuel sector. Today, we use about 20 million barrels of oil a day. A decade ago, you know how much oil we used in this country? About 20 million barrels a day.

Today, we use 40 percent less coal than we did 10 years ago. Do you know why? Because those industries cannot compete. People, given the choice, prefer cleaner, cheaper energy.

The fastest growing vehicle segment is electric vehicles. The fastest growing source in the power sector is renewable energy. Energy is getting cheaper. What is the energy industry doing in response? They are becoming exporters. The reason why the gas industry is growing, the reason why the oil industry is growing is because they are building terminals to export overseas. What is hard about that is that the American people don't want you to drill in their backyard. They don't want you to drill a pipeline through their neighborhood just so that you can run it to a terminal and sell it overseas at a profit.

If you are of the opinion that the American people don't have any say in how their communities look, how their natural parks look, how their natural lands look, and if you are of the opinion that the profits of energy producers vastly outweigh the interests of energy consumers, vote for this amendment. However, if you put energy consumers first, this is an absolute "no."

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

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't understand this.

This administration just last month removed NEPA for the Floyd Bennett Field to host migrants. The Biden administration completely took NEPA off the table for their agenda because of the open border. By the way, the IRA, the IIJA, and the CHIPS Act are not going to happen without permitting reforms and NEPA changes. Come hell or high water, it is not going to happen without the changes. I think both sides of the aisle understand that and agree with that.

We have the highest standard of living in the world because of our process. This administration continues to put up roadblocks for energy transmission, distribution, generation, mining projects, nuclear projects, road construction projects, dams, and forest management. Everything that the American people want to do in a reasonable fashion is held up in part because of NEPA. This is a very good amendment, and I urge adoption.

Mr. Chair, in closing, we can agree that our permitting process is broken. In the debt ceiling, we got a couple of permitting concerns addressed that were generational, hadn't been done in 40 years. We want to be able to make sure that the American worker, the American manufacturer, American technology, our natural resources in our country can be used responsibly.

Why are we putting agreements together with the Congo to mine our minerals that we have, for instance, in

northern Minnesota, the biggest copper-nickel find in the world. Why are we doing that?

Why is this administration stopping the American worker, stopping the creativity that we have, stopping not only our energy independence but our national security by going to our adversaries and asking them for our critical minerals or asking them for their energy? We can do better.

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. 130 OFFERED BY MR. STAUBER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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 finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule of the Council on Environmental Quality titled "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions Phase 2" and published July 31, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 49924).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 338, 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 finalize or otherwise carry out the Biden administration's proposed NEPA Phase 2 rule.

Rather than working to fix our broken permitting system and working to address the incredible challenges and barriers NEPA poses, the Biden administration's proposed rule makes our already broken system even worse. This proposed rule expands the broken NEPA framework, adds additional requirements, and creates new tools for opponents to shut down good projects.

The NEPA Phase 2 rule would require Federal agencies not only to consider climate change but also add a new requirement to consider environmental justice during the NEPA review process, including environmental tree justice and tree equity. These new requirements are just another way that opponents of highway infrastructure projects, water infrastructure projects, critical mineral mining projects, renewable energy projects, transmission projects, oil and gas development projects get to a "no." This administration does not want to do it here in the United States of America.

Additionally, the NEPA Phase 2 rule violates the reforms Congress has put forth to address our permitting woes. These reforms were part of the bipar-

tisan Fiscal Responsibility Act that we passed earlier this year.

Trust me, the permitting provisions in the debt ceiling agreement did not solve all of our permitting problems, but they were an important step in the right direction. For example, it included strict page limits and review deadlines for an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement.

Does the NEPA Phase 2 rule implement these reforms? Absolutely not.

This administration is not following the laws that Congress put forward. In fact, when CEQ chair Brenda Mallory, the Biden administration official tasked with fixing NEPA and our broken permitting system, testified before the Natural Resources Committee in June, she claimed the administration didn't need to change a thing.

□ 1000

She told Congress this administration would just follow and do business as usual.

She falsely claimed that this administration was already doing everything the debt ceiling agreement instructed it to do, and that is absolutely not true.

The NEPA Phase 2 rule is a blatant show of disregard for congressional intent and the law that this body passed and President Biden signed into law.

The NEPA Phase 2 rule is completely misguided. It is a step in the wrong direction, and it is important we vote today to prevent the administration from moving to finalize the rule.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, what this amendment does is that it allows American energy, American prosperity, American technology, and American workers to provide energy and critical minerals, transmission projects, highway and bridge projects, dams and rivers.

This allows us to do it here. This allows our communities to have a voice in what happens, not Federal three-letter agency bureaucrats telling the American people what they need and what is best in their communities because our local elected officials know better than Washington, D.C., and the bureaucrats.

These three-letter agencies are out of control. They are unelected. They are not accountable to anybody, and this administration is not following the laws that this body passed.

For years and years, administrations haven't followed what Congress and the Senate have put forward. It is about time we do that, and it can start today.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment, and 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. 131 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 131 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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, before the short title, insert the following:

OCEAN JUSTICE STRATEGY

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the Ocean Justice Strategy referenced in the Notice titled “Ocean Justice Strategy” (88 Fed. Reg. 37518; published June 8, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Chair, I commend my colleague from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for the great work that he and his committee did in giving us this appropriation bill. I also commend the minority and everyone who spent so much time on the floor working through these amendments. Everybody will be glad to know that this is the last one. It is a great one, and I hope everybody will support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I obviously support my amendment, which prohibits funds from being used to implement the Biden administration’s ocean justice strategy, which undermines the intent of the Ocean Policy Committee by forcing so-called environmental justice principles into the Federal Government’s role in ocean economic activities.

In 2018, then-President Trump signed Executive Order No. 13840, which established the Ocean Policy Committee. The Ocean Policy Committee, co-chaired by CEQ and the Office of Science and Technology Policy, was created to focus on growing the ocean economy, prioritizing scientific research, coordinating resources and data sharing, and engaging with stakeholders.

The committee was codified into law through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021.

The Ocean Policy Committee should be working on important issues, such as leveraging resources and expertise to maximize the effectiveness of Federal investments in ocean research. Unfortunately, this administration has chosen to advance a misguided agenda that is not focused on the founding tenets of the Ocean Policy Committee to grow the ocean economy. Instead, it is

pushing concepts like the ocean justice strategy, which forces environmental justice principles into the Federal Government’s ocean activities.

Ocean justice or environmental justice should not be used to hijack legitimate work that benefits the American people. It cannot and should not become a driving force and detrimental tool to impede our Federal resources management.

For those reasons, I support and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this 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, as far as I can tell, this is just another attack on environmental justice. The Council on Environmental Quality is coordinating the development of an ocean justice strategy that will propose equitable and just practices to advance safety, health, and prosperity for communities that are residing near the ocean, the coast, and the Great Lakes. This amendment seeks to block that strategy.

Coastlines are home to approximately 40 percent of the United States population. Unfortunately, coastal communities do not share equitably in the benefits provided by the ocean or equitably bear the burden of the negative impacts of human activities associated with the ocean, such as climate change, coastal flooding, and other threats.

Environmental justice ensures that all Americans receive the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards. This amendment is just another way to attack minority groups at all costs and return the United States to a time when environmental discrimination was the norm.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, the Ocean Policy Committee should focus on addressing the issues that it was actually created to address—most importantly, streamlining Federal coordination.

This administration’s push of this ocean justice strategy is just another example of unchecked bureaucrats forcing their agenda on Americans and increasing red tape.

My amendment stops them from moving forward. Our ocean economy is as diverse as the ocean itself, and there is no one-size-fits-all approach to managing it. The problem we have with Federal programs is they take a different course from how Congress intended for them to go. This isn’t cutting funds from the Ocean Policy Committee. It is just forcing the Ocean Policy Committee to do the job that they were established to do without adding unnecessary burdens to their work.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, once again, I am kind of caught in this challenge of not understanding exactly what it is that my colleagues don’t like about the term “environmental justice,” or in this case, “ocean justice.”

It seems like “justice” is a word that we are very comfortable with in a patriotic way that everyone understands. Justice is important in this country.

As a Member who represents as much coastline as anybody in here that is extremely impacted by the challenges that are going on in the ocean, such as sea level rise and extreme storms, I have to deal with these questions. I think it is totally appropriate to have a justice strategy in making sure that we have equitability in how we take care of people.

If you live in a community where it is underresourced and are impacted by these ocean storms that come at us with total surprise—for example, a winter storm or nor’easter, as we call them, or a hurricane in the southern part of the country, and there aren’t resources to rebuild. Perhaps sea level rise is making it so that your community needs to be moved.

I was talking last night about the 31 Native communities in Alaska that have to be moved because of sea level rise. If you don’t have a justice lens, somebody might turn around and just say: I am sorry. This community isn’t valuable enough. You don’t have the resources, and your people can’t move their own homes. You can’t deal with rebuilding the coastal protections, so the money is going somewhere else, to a wealthier community, to someplace where we think people matter more.

Those decisions are critical decisions about how we spend our Federal funds, about how we make sure the work we do is equitable. Climate change is having a huge impact on life on the ocean.

I do not want to criticize my colleague. I am sure he has put this forward in good faith, but the last I saw, Arkansas doesn’t have an ocean, and my colleague is trying to make policy for those of us who represent ocean communities in the East, West, and South throughout this country, the 40 percent of the United States population that lives on the ocean. These are critical strategies for us.

We don’t need to make the same mistakes that we made in the past with not having a lens of environmental justice. Why in the world would we want to turn back and have discrimination and make bad policy? Why in the world when we are facing some of the most severe crises we have ever seen? We have hurricanes that come on us with no warning, extreme storms in the winter, extreme storms at times of the year we never expected them.

I can go on for much more time than I have to talk about what just happened in my own State and the challenges people are worried about, about sea level rise, about the ocean impact

of storms. This would take away the opportunity to look forward on that and make sure that our funding is equitable, that all communities are taken care of, that all parts of the country, particularly those rural areas that probably my colleague represents and I represent that are often underresourced are thought about, as well.

Again, this is a misguided amendment. People are going after a language that either they just don't want to say or somehow don't believe in or want to bring us back to a time when we had discrimination in our Federal policy and how we spent our Federal funds. It is a misguided amendment. It is a bad idea.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 118-261 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 120 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 126 by Mr. ROY of Texas.

Amendment No. 127 by Mr. ROY of Texas.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 120, printed in part A of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 204, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—214

Aderholt	Bice	Carey
Alford	Biggs	Carl
Allen	Bilirakis	Carter (GA)
Amodei	Bishop (NC)	Carter (TX)
Armstrong	Boebert	Chavez-DeRemer
Arrington	Bost	Ciscomani
Babin	Brecheen	Cline
Bacon	Buchanan	Cloud
Baird	Buck	Clyde
Balderson	Bucshon	Cole
Banks	Burchett	Collins
Barr	Burgess	Comer
Bean (FL)	Burlison	Crane
Bentz	Calvert	Crawford
Bergman	Cammack	Crenshaw

D'Esposito	James
Davidson	Johnson (OH)
De La Cruz	Johnson (SD)
DesJarlais	Jordan
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (PA)
Donalds	Kean (NJ)
Duarte	Kelly (MS)
Duncan	Kelly (PA)
Dunn (FL)	Kiggans (VA)
Edwards	Kiley
Ellzey	Kim (CA)
Emmer	Kustoff
Estes	LaLota
Ezell	LaMalfa
Fallon	Lamborn
Feenstra	Langworthy
Ferguson	Latta
Finstad	LaTurner
Fischbach	Lawler
Fitzgerald	Lee (FL)
Fleischmann	Letlow
Flood	Loudermill
Fox	Lucas
Franklin, Scott	Luetkemeyer
Fry	Luna
Fulcher	Luttrell
Gaetz	Mace
Gallagher	Malliotakis
Garcia, Mike	Mann
Gimenez	Massie
Gonzales, Tony	Mast
González-Colón	McCarthy
Good (VA)	McCaul
Gooden (TX)	McClain
Gosar	McClintock
Granger	McCormick
Graves (LA)	McHenry
Graves (MO)	Meuser
Green (TN)	Miller (IL)
Greene (GA)	Miller (WV)
Griffith	Miller-Meeks
Grothman	Mills
Guest	Molinaro
Guthrie	Moolenaar
Hageman	Mooney
Harris	Moore (AL)
Harshbarger	Moore (UT)
Hern	Moran
Higgins (LA)	Moylan
Hill	Murphy
Hinson	Nehls
Houchin	Norman
Hudson	Nunn (IA)
Huizenga	Obernolte
Hunt	Ogles
Issa	Owens
Jackson (TX)	Palmer

#### NOES—204

Adams	Courtney
Aguilar	Craig
Alfred	Crockett
Auchincloss	Crow
Balint	Cuellar
Barragán	Curtis
Beatty	Dauids (KS)
Bera	Davis (IL)
Beyer	Davis (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Dean (PA)
Blumenauer	DeGette
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro
Bonamici	DelBene
Bowman	Deluzio
Boyle (PA)	DeSaulnier
Brown	Dingell
Brownley	Doggett
Budzinski	Escobar
Bush	Eshoo
Caraveo	Españillat
Carbajal	Evans
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick
Carson	Fletcher
Carter (LA)	Poster
Cartwright	Foushee
Casar	Frankel, Lois
Case	Frost
Casten	Gallego
Castor (FL)	Garamendi
Cherfilus-	Garcia (IL)
McCormick	Garcia (TX)
Chu	Garcia, Robert
Clark (MA)	Golden (ME)
Clarke (NY)	Goldman (NY)
Cleaver	Gomez
Clyburn	Gonzalez,
Cohen	Vicente
Connolly	Gottheimer
Correa	Green, Al (TX)
Costa	Grijalva

Pence	McGovern
Perry	Meeks
Pfleger	Menendez
Posey	Meng
Reschenthaler	Mfume
Rodgers (WA)	Moore (WI)
Rogers (AL)	Morelle
Rogers (KY)	Moskowitz
Rose	Moulton
Rosendale	Mrvan
Rouzer	Mullin
Roy	Nadler
Rutherford	Neal
Salazar	Neguse
Santos	Nickel
Scalise	Norcross
Schweikert	Norton
Scott, Austin	Ocasio-Cortez
Self	Omar
Sessions	Pallone
Simpson	Panetta
Smith (MO)	Pappas
Smith (NE)	Pascrell
Smith (NJ)	Payne
Smucker	Pelosi
Spartz	Peltola
Stauber	Perez
Steel	Peters
Stefanik	Castro (TX)
Steil	Garbarino
Steube	Hoyle (OR)
Strong	Jackson Lee
Tenney	Joyce (OH)
Thompson (PA)	Kamlager-Dove
Tiffany	Kuster
Timmons	Valadao
Turner	Van Drew
Valadao	Van Dуйne
Van Drew	Van Orden
Van Dуйne	Wagner
Van Orden	Walberg
Wagner	Waltz
Walberg	Weber (TX)
Waltz	Webster (FL)
Weber (TX)	Wenstrup
Webster (FL)	Westerman
Wenstrup	Williams (NY)
Westerman	Williams (TX)
Williams (NY)	Wilson
Williams (TX)	Wittman
Wilson	Womack
Wittman	Yakym
Womack	Zinke
Yakym	
Zinke	

McGarvey	Petersen
McGovern	Pingree
Meeks	Pocan
Menendez	Porter
Meng	Pressley
Mfume	Quigley
Moore (WI)	Ramirez
Morelle	Raskin
Moskowitz	Ross
Moulton	Ruiz
Mrvan	Ruppersberger
Mullin	Ryan
Nadler	Sablan
Neal	Salinas
Neguse	Sánchez
Nickel	Sarbanes
Norcross	Schiff
Norton	Schneider
Ocasio-Cortez	Scholten
Omar	Schrier
Pallone	Scott (VA)
Panetta	Scott, David
Pappas	Sherman
Pascrell	Sherrill
Payne	Slotkin
Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Peltola	Sorensen
Perez	Soto
Peters	Spanberger

#### NOT VOTING—20

Castro (TX)	LaHood	Radewagen
Garbarino	Lesko	Scanlon
Hoyle (OR)	Miller (OH)	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Sewell
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Underwood
Kamlager-Dove	Phillips	Wexton
Kuster	Plaskett	

□ 1039

Mrs. PELTOLA and Ms. BROWN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SCHWEIKERT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MR. ROY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LALOTA). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 126, printed in part A of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 204, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Bishop (NC)	Clyde
Alford	Boebert	Cole
Allen	Bost	Collins
Amodei	Brecheen	Comer
Armstrong	Buchanan	Crane
Arrington	Buck	Crawford
Babin	Bucshon	Crenshaw
Bacon	Burchett	Curtis
Baird	Burgess	D'Esposito
Balderson	Burlison	Davidson
Banks	Calvert	De La Cruz
Barr	Cammack	DesJarlais
Bean (FL)	Carey	Diaz-Balart
Bentz	Carl	Donalds
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Duarte
Bice	Carter (TX)	Duncan
Biggs	Ciscomani	Dunn (FL)
Bilirakis	Cloud	Edwards



Ellzey Kelly (MS)  
Emmer Kelly (PA)  
Estes Kiggans (VA)  
Ezell Kiley  
Fallon Kim (CA)  
Feenstra Kustoff  
Ferguson LaLota  
Finstad LaMalfa  
Fischbach Lamborn  
Fitzgerald Langworthy  
Fleischmann Latta  
Flood LaTurner  
Foxy Lawler  
Franklin, Scott Lee (FL)  
Fry Letlow  
Fulcher Loudermilk  
Gaetz Lucas  
Gallagher Luetkemeyer  
Garcia, Mike Luna  
Gimenez Luttrell  
Gonzales, Tony Mace  
González-Colón Malliotakis  
Good (VA) Mann  
Gooden (TX) Massie  
Gosar Mast  
Granger McCarthy  
Graves (LA) McCaul  
Graves (MO) McClain  
Green (TN) McClintock  
Greene (GA) McCormick  
Griffith McHenry  
Grothman Meuser  
Guest Miller (WV)  
Guthrie Miller-Meeks  
Hageman Mills  
Harris Molinaro  
Harshbarger Moolenaar  
Hern Mooney  
Higgins (LA) Moore (AL)  
Hill Moore (UT)  
Hinson Moran  
Houchin Moylan  
Hudson Murphy  
Huizenga Nehls  
Hunt Norman  
Issa Nunn (IA)  
Jackson (TX) Obernolte  
James Ogles  
Johnson (OH) Owens  
Johnson (SD) Palmer  
Jordan Pence  
Joyce (PA) Perry  
Kean (NJ) Plunger

Posey Mullin  
Reschenthaler Nadler  
Rodgers (WA) Neal  
Rogers (AL) Neguse  
Rogers (KY) Nickel  
Rose Norcross  
Norton Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin

Ross Swalwell  
Ruiz Sykes  
Ruppersberger Takano  
Ryan Thanedar  
Sablan Thompson (CA)  
Salinas Thompson (MS)  
Sánchez Titus  
Sarbanes Tlaib  
Schiff Tokuda  
Schneider Tonko  
Scholten Torres (CA)  
Schrier Torres (NY)  
Scott (VA) Trahan  
Scott, David Trone  
Sherman Vargas  
Sherrill Vasquez  
Slotkin Veasey  
Smith (WA) Velázquez  
Sorensen Wasserman  
Soto Schultz  
Spanberger Waters  
Stansbury Watson Coleman  
Stanton Wild  
Stevens Williams (GA)  
Strickland Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Castro (TX) Lesko  
Cline Miller (IL)  
Garbarino Miller (OH)  
Jackson Lee Napolitano  
Joyce (OH) Newhouse  
Kamlager-Dove Phillips  
Kuster Plaskett  
LaHood Porter

Issa Jackson (TX)  
Curtis James  
D'Esposito Johnson (LA)  
Davidson Johnson (OH)  
De La Cruz Johnson (SD)  
DesJarlais Jordan  
Diaz-Balart Joyce (PA)  
Donalds Kean (NJ)  
Duarte Kelly (MS)  
Duncan Kelly (VA)  
Dunn (FL) Kiggans (VA)  
Edwards Kim (CA)  
Ellzey Kustoff  
Emmer LaLota  
Estes LaMalfa  
Ezell Lamborn  
Fallon Langworthy  
Feenstra Latta  
Ferguson LaTurner  
Finstad Lawler  
Fischbach Lee (FL)  
Fitzgerald Letlow  
Fleischmann Loudermilk  
Flood Lucas  
Foxy Luetkemeyer  
Franklin, Scott Luna  
Fry Luttrell  
Guthrie Malliotakis  
Gallagher Mann  
Garcia, Mike Massie  
Gimenez Mast  
Gonzales, Tony McCarthy  
González-Colón McClain  
Good (VA) McClintock  
Gooden (TX) McCormick  
Granger McHenry  
Graves (LA) Meuser  
Graves (MO) Miller (IL)  
Green (TN) Miller (WV)  
Greene (GA) Miller-Meeks  
Griffith Mills  
Grothman Molinaro  
Guest Wagner  
Guthrie Moolenaar  
Hageman Mooney  
Harris Moore (AL)  
Harshbarger Moore (UT)  
Hern Moran  
Higgins (LA) Moylan  
Hill Murphy  
Hinson Nehls  
Houchin Norman  
Hudson Obernolte  
Huizenga Ogles  
Hunt Owens  
Palmer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1044

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

Stated against:  
Ms. PORTER. Mr. Chair, I was unable to  
reach a voting station from my official meeting  
in the Capitol during the two-minute window.  
Had I been present, I would have voted “no”  
on rollcall No. 594.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. ROY  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on amendment No. 127, printed in  
part A of House Report 118-261 offered  
by the gentleman from Texas (Mr.  
ROY), on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the ayes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.  
The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 208, noes 207,  
not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—208

NOES—204  
Adams Crow  
Aguilar Cuellar  
Allred Davids (KS)  
Auchincloss Davis (IL)  
Balint Davis (NC)  
Barragán Dean (PA)  
Beatty DeGette  
Bera DeLauro  
Beyer DelBene  
Bishop (GA) Deluzio  
Blumenauer DeSaulnier  
Blunt Rochester Dingell  
Bonamici Doggett  
Bowman Escobar  
Boyle (PA) Eshoo  
Brown Espallat  
Brownley Evans  
Budzinski Fitzpatrick  
Bush Fletcher  
Caraveo Foster  
Carbajal Foushee  
Cárdenas Frankel, Lois  
Carson Frost  
Cartwright Gallego  
Casar Garamendi  
Case Garcia (IL)  
Casten Garcia (TX)  
Castor (FL) Garcia, Robert  
Chavez-DeRemer Golden (ME)  
Cherfilus Goldman (NY)  
McCormick Gomez  
Chu Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Clark (MA) Gottheimer  
Clarke (NY) Green, Al (TX)  
Cleaver Grijalva  
Clyburn Harder (CA)  
Cohen Hayes  
Connolly Higgins (NY)  
Correa Himes  
Costa Horsford  
Courtney Houlihan  
Craig Hoyer  
Crockett Hoyle (OR)

Aderholt Bice  
Alford Biggs  
Allen Bilirakis  
Amodei Bishop (NC)  
Armstrong Boebert  
Babin Bost  
Bacon Brecheen  
Baird Buchanan  
Balderson Buck  
Banks Buchson  
Barr Burchett  
Bean (FL) Burgess  
Bentz Burlison  
Bergman Calvert

NOES—207  
Adams Courtney  
Aguilar Craig  
Allred Crockett  
Auchincloss Crow  
Balint Cuellar  
Barragán Davids (KS)  
Beatty Davis (IL)  
Bera Davis (NC)  
Beyer Dean (PA)  
Bishop (GA) DeGette  
Blumenauer DeLauro  
Blunt Rochester DelBene  
Bonamici Deluzio  
Bowman DeSaulnier  
Boyle (PA) Dingell  
Brown Doggett  
Brownley Escobar  
Budzinski Eshoo  
Bush Espallat  
Caraveo Evans  
Carbajal Fitzpatrick  
Cárdenas Fletcher  
Carson Foster  
Carter (LA) Foushee  
Cartwright Frankel, Lois  
Casar Frost  
Case Gallego  
Casten Garamendi  
Castor (FL) Garcia (IL)  
Chavez-DeRemer Garcia (TX)  
Cherfilus- Garcia, Robert  
McCormick Golden (ME)  
Chu Goldman (NY)  
Clark (MA) Gomez  
Clarke (NY) Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Cleaver Gottheimer  
Clyburn Green, Al (TX)  
Cohen Grijalva  
Connolly Harder (CA)  
Correa Hayes

Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlihan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kiley  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Mace  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCaul  
McClellan

McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neguse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Norton  
Nunn (IA)  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola

Perez  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Sablan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto

Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—24

Arrington  
Castro (TX)  
Garbarino  
Gosar  
Jackson Lee  
Joyce (OH)  
Kamllager-Dove  
Kuster

LaHood  
Lesko  
Miller (OH)  
Napolitano  
Newhouse  
Petersen  
Phillips  
Plaskett

Radewagen  
Rutherford  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Sewell  
Torres (NY)  
Underwood  
Wexton

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1047

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, had I been  
present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall  
No. 595.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose;  
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.  
LALOTA) having assumed the chair, Mr.  
STEUBE, 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. 4821) making appropriations for  
the Department of the Interior, envi-  
ronment, and related agencies for the  
fiscal year ending September 30, 2024,  
and for other purposes, and, pursuant  
to House Resolution 838, he reported  
the bill back to the House with sundry  
amendments adopted in the Committee  
of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under  
the rule, the previous question is or-  
dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any  
amendment reported from the Com-  
mittee of the Whole? If not, the Chair  
will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr.  
Speaker, I have a motion to recommit  
at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The  
Clerk will report the motion to recom-  
mit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves  
to recommit the bill H.R. 4821 to the Com-  
mittee on Appropriations.

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

The question is on the motion to re-  
commit.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr.  
Speaker, on that I demand the yeas  
and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant  
to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-  
minute vote on the motion to recom-  
mit will be followed by a 5-minute vote  
on passage of the bill; and the motion  
to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3774.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—yeas 201, nays  
215, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

YEAS—201

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragán  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio

DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert  
Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)

Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Magaziner  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neguse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Petersen  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan

Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto

Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Swalwell  
Sykes  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko

Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

## NAYS—215

Aderholt  
Alford  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bean (FL)  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Breechen  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Burlison  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chavez-DeRemer  
Ciscomani  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde  
Cole  
Collins  
Comer  
Crane  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
D'Esposito  
Davidson  
De La Cruz  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duarte  
Duncan  
Dunn (FL)  
Edwards  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Ezell  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Finstad  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flood  
Fox  
Franklin, Scott  
Fry

Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garcia, Mike  
Gimenez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hageman  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hern  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Houchin  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunt  
Issa  
Jackson (TX)  
James  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (PA)  
Kean (NJ)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kiggans (VA)  
Kiley  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaLota  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Langworthy  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lawler  
Lee (FL)  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luna  
Luttrell  
Mace  
Malliottakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McCormick  
McHenry  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)

Miller-Meeks  
Mills  
Molinaro  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Moran  
Murphy  
Nehls  
Norman  
Nunn (IA)  
Oberholte  
Ogles  
Owens  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Santos  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Self  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyn  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

## NOT VOTING—17

Castro (TX)  
Garbarino  
Jackson Lee  
Joyce (OH)  
Kamllager-Dove  
Kuster

LaHood  
Lesko  
Miller (OH)  
Napolitano  
Newhouse  
Phillips

Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Sewell  
Underwood  
Wexton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1056

Ms. WATERS and Mr. VEASEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays 203, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 597]

YEAS—213

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

Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym

Zinke

NAYS—203

Adams	Garcia (TX)
Aguilar	Garcia, Robert
Allred	Golden (ME)
Auchincloss	Goldman (NY)
Balint	Gomez
Barragan	Gottheimer
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)
Bera	Grijalva
Beyer	Harder (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Hayes
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Himes
Bonamicci	Horsford
Bowman	Houlahan
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer
Brown	Hoyle (OR)
Brownley	Huffman
Budzinski	Ivey
Bush	Jackson (IL)
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)
Carbajal	Jacobs
Cardenas	Jayapal
Carson	Jeffries
Carter (LA)	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Kaptur
Casar	Keating
Case	Kelly (IL)
Casten	Khanna
Castor (FL)	Kildee
Cherfilus-	Kilmer
McCormick	Kim (NJ)
Chu	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Landsman
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Lawler
Cohen	Lee (CA)
Connolly	Lee (NV)
Correa	Lee (PA)
Costa	Leger Fernandez
Courtney	Levin
Craig	Lieu
Crockett	Lofgren
Crow	Lynch
Cuellar	Magaziner
Davids (KS)	Manning
Davis (IL)	Matsui
Davis (NC)	McBath
Dean (PA)	McClellan
DeGette	McCollum
DeLauro	McGarvey
DelBene	McGovern
Deluzio	Meeks
DeSaulnier	Menendez
Dingell	Meng
Doggett	Mfume
Escobar	Molinaro
Eshoo	Moore (WI)
Espallat	Morelle
Evans	Moskowitz
Fitzpatrick	Moulton
Fletcher	Mrvan
Foster	Mullin
Foushee	Nadler
Frankel, Lois	Neal
Frost	Neguse
Gallego	Nickel
Garamendi	Norcross
Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez

Omar	Pallone
Panetta	Pappas
Pascrell	Payne
Pelosi	Peltola
Perez	Peters
Pettersen	Pingree
Pocan	Porter
Pressley	Quigley
Ramirez	Raskin
Ross	Ruiz
Ruppersberger	Ryan
Salinas	Sánchez
Sarbanes	Schiff
Schneider	Scholten
Schrier	Scott (VA)
Scott (VA)	Scott, David
Sherman	Sherrill
Sherrill	Slotkin
Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)
Sorensen	Soto
Spanberger	Stansbury
Stanton	Stevens
Strickland	Swalwell
Sykes	Takano
Thandekar	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Titus	Tlaib
Tonko	Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)	Torres (NY)
Trahan	Trone
Vargas	Vasquez
Velázquez	Wasserman
Wasserman	Schultz
Waters	Watson Coleman
Wild	Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)	Wilson (FL)

STOP HARBORING IRANIAN PETROLEUM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3774) to impose additional sanctions with respect to the importation or facilitation of the importation of petroleum products from Iran, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 69, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

YEAS—342

Adams	Crawford	Greene (GA)
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Griffith
Aguilar	Crockett	Grothman
Alford	Crow	Guest
Allen	Cuellar	Guthrie
Allred	Curtis	Hageman
Amodei	D'Esposito	Harder (CA)
Arrington	Davids (KS)	Harris
Auchincloss	Davidson	Harshbarger
Babin	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Bacon	Davis (NC)	Hern
Baird	De La Cruz	Higgins (LA)
Balderson	DeLauro	Higgins (NY)
Banks	DelBene	Hill
Barr	Deluzio	Himes
Bean (FL)	DesJarlais	Hinson
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Horsford
Bentz	Dingell	Houchin
Bera	Donalds	Hoyer
Bergman	Duarte	Hoyle (OR)
Bice	Duncan	Hudson
Biggs	Dunn (FL)	Huizenga
Bilirakis	Edwards	Hunt
Bishop (GA)	Ellzey	Issa
Bishop (NC)	Emmer	Ivey
Boebert	Eshoo	Jackson (NC)
Bost	Espallat	Jackson (TX)
Boyle (PA)	Estes	James
Brecheen	Ezell	Jeffries
Brown	Fallon	Johnson (LA)
Brownley	Feenstra	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Buck	Finstad	Jordan
Bucshon	Fischbach	Joyce (PA)
Budzinski	Fitzgerald	Kaptur
Burchett	Fitzpatrick	Kean (NJ)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Keating
Burlison	Fletcher	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Flood	Kelly (PA)
Cammack	Foushee	Kiggans (VA)
Caraveo	Foxx	Kildee
Carbajal	Frankel, Lois	Kiley
Carey	Franklin, Scott	Kilmer
Carl	Fry	Kim (CA)
Carter (GA)	Fulcher	Kim (NJ)
Carter (LA)	Gaetz	Krishnamoorthi
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Kustoff
Cartwright	Gallego	LaLota
Case	Garamendi	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Garcia (TX)	Lamborn
Chavez-DeRemer	Garcia, Mike	Landsman
Cherfilus-	Garcia, Robert	Langworthy
McCormick	Gimenez	Larsen (WA)
Ciscomani	Golden (ME)	Larson (CT)
Clark (MA)	Goldman (NY)	Latta
Cline	Gomez	LaTurner
Cloud	Gonzales, Tony	Lawler
Clyde	Gonzalez,	Lee (FL)
Cohen	Vicente	Lee (NV)
Cole	Gooden (TX)	Letlow
Collins	Gosar	Levin
Comer	Gottheimer	Lieu
Connolly	Granger	Lofgren
Costa	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Courtney	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Craig	Green (TN)	Luetkemeyer
Crane	Green, Al (TX)	Luna

NOT VOTING—17

Castro (TX)	LaHood	Scanlon
Garbarino	Lesko	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	Miller (OH)	Sewell
Joyce (OH)	Napolitano	Underwood
Kamlager-Dove	Newhouse	Wexton
Kuster	Phillips	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1103

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.