

designed to provide the President of the United States with diplomatic, military, intelligence, and economic information to coordinate, to plan, and to implement national security, and to make sound decisions affecting national security with input from professionals and not from political operatives. And the National Security Council has done that for seven decades.

Yet, last week, the President issued an ill-conceived, dangerous, and unconstitutional executive order that bans Muslims. It puts Americans abroad, American communities at home, and American soldiers around the world at risk; and I believe that Steve Bannon, who might become a member of the National Security Council, was the architect of that executive order.

Mr. Speaker, I ask President Trump, if he is not willing to remove Mr. Bannon from the White House, at least, for the safety of this country, remove him from the National Security Council.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN OUR COUNTRY

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon really with a very, very sad and heavy heart. I don't know anyone in our country who watched what took place across the country who wasn't dismayed, who wasn't heartbroken, who wasn't confused. And as my constituents said: What is happening in our country?

Now, there are some that say this must be done. This executive order must be done in the name of national security.

I am a veteran of the House Intelligence Committee, but it doesn't take a veteran of the House Intelligence Committee to understand that this harms our national security.

We need to have more voices in the House. We need Republicans and Democrats standing up together, because historians will replace your surname, and those that don't raise their voices will be called coward because this is ripping at the fabric and the soul of our Nation. It is appalling. It is unlawful. I believe it is unconstitutional.

If you stood up for history and what was done to others, it is taking place right now in our country.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 38, DISAPPROVING A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 70 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 70

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the

House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 38) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) One hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman and my good friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, just yesterday, the House Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 70, providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 38, legislation utilizing the Congressional Review Act to overturn the final stream protection rule promulgated by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, or the OSMRE, which is at the Department of the Interior. The rule provides for consideration of the joint resolution under a closed rule, as is customary with these CRA measures.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of a critical measure that will help protect American businesses and families from the Obama administration's rampant regulatory overreach. H.J. Res. 38 disapproves of the final stream protection rule which was released by the Department of the Interior on December 19, 2016, representing yet another last-minute, midnight regulation from the previous administration.

This burdensome rule seeks to govern the interaction between surface mining operations and streams by establishing a buffer-zone rule that blocks mining within 100 feet of those streams. This was done, despite the Department of the Interior's own reports, which shows that virtually all coal mines in this country have no offsite impacts, they are being operated safely, and that lands are being restored successfully under existing Federal and State regulation.

During the rulemaking process, OSMRE and the Department of the In-

terior ignored existing regulatory success at the Federal and the State level and shut out the cooperating agencies, the States who are responsible for enforcing Federal mining regulations.

In 2015, 9 of the 10 cooperating States withdrew as cooperating agencies in the rulemaking and development process, due to OSMRE's exclusionary tactics, failure to provide for meaningful participation, and continual limiting of the States' involvement over the past several years.

The National Environmental Policy Act or, as we know it as, NEPA, requires OSMRE, as the lead rulemaking agency, to involve States in the drafting of the regulation and requires them to involve States. These failures, and the restrictive tactics that were employed by OSMRE, led the House Natural Resources Committee chairman, Mr. ROB BISHOP of Utah, to send a letter in 2015 to the GAO, the Government Accountability Office, requesting a review of OSMRE's compliance with NEPA in the agencies' development and drafting of the proposed stream protection rule. Ample evidence exists that OSMRE excluded these States from the NEPA process, in contradiction of both NEPA regulations and the memoranda of understanding between OSMRE and the States.

Mr. Speaker, the stream protection rule unilaterally rewrites over 400 existing rules and regulations. It threatens over one-third of the Nation's coal mining workforce and will send repercussions throughout the broader U.S. economy. The final rule is the definition of a one-size-fits-all solution due to OSMRE's failure to conduct the 7-year rewrite in a transparent process consistent with their statutory requirements to engage State and local stakeholders.

An economic analysis conducted by the National Mining Association found that the total number of jobs at risk of loss is somewhere between 112,000 and 280,000 people, approximately 30 to 75 percent of the current industry employment levels.

Further, the misguided regulation would jeopardize 40,000 to 77,000 jobs in both surface and underground mining operations, industries that are still reeling from 8 years of overregulation from the previous administration.

And while the Obama administration never seemed to mind the consequences of its actions on hardworking Americans, I can assure you that the new, unified Republican government is opposed to ineffective regulations like this one which unnecessarily put people out of work, raise energy costs on consumers, and do nothing to improve the environment.

By passing this rule, we have the opportunity to consider a resolution that will prevent this regulation from removing over one-half of the total U.S. coal reserves available for extraction, while also reducing oppressive barriers to responsible coal production.

The Congressional Review Act of 1996 was enacted to be a powerful tool to

allow Congress to overturn last-minute regulations from the previous administration, under an expedited legislative process. If Congress passes a joint resolution disapproving the rule, and the resolution becomes a law, the rule cannot take effect or continue. CRAs are designed to address and invalidate problematic rules from the previous administration, and the stream protection rule clearly fits the bill.

Furthermore, this CRA provides certainty to State regulatory bodies tasked with regulating 97 percent of the coal mines in the United States and enforcing Federal mining regulations by strengthening the State primacy framework provided in the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act.

Blocking the final stream protection rule will restore an important stream of State and Federal tax revenue associated with coal extraction across the country that is benefiting hardworking American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body wants to protect the environment, ensure clean water and clean air for our citizens, and encourage innovative and responsible ways to produce energy. However, these goals are not mutually exclusive, as some opponents of this legislation will argue.

It is past time that we embrace commonsense, practical Federal rules and regulations that protect the environment and the countless Americans working in the industries that support our economy and provide for greater domestic energy independence.

The rule we consider here today provides for the consideration of a bill that is critically important to the future economic growth and job growth of our country. By passing this CRA, we can take a badly needed step toward protecting American families and businesses from the rampant executive overreach that will be the defining achievement of the past administration.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of a joint resolution disapproving of a Department of the Interior regulation known as the stream protection rule.

Through this action, my Republican colleagues are now attempting to repeal a thoughtful and thoroughly vetted regulation that reflects current science, technology, and mining practices in order to better protect people and the environment from the negative impacts of mountaintop removal min-

ing. This regulation took 7 years to develop and updates a 30-year-old coal mining regulation.

This regulation is not, as we have seen coming out of the administration of late, some fly-by-night executive order, but rather a serious attempt by serious people to make us a healthier and more environmentally conscious nation.

However, what we see here today is business as usual for the Republican majority—turning a blind eye to science in order to help wealthy polluters at the expense of the public's health and the environment. Just because my friends' unending attempts to normalize such misguided governance have become almost numbing in their effect does not make such attempts any less appalling to those of us who believe in the scientific method and a clean and safe environment.

Indeed, the paucity of care that we see here today in ridding the books of a regulation that hardworking and good people took 7 years to write with, mind you, input from all stakeholders, is starting to look like a variation of a theme when we consider the paucity of care the Republicans in the White House have exhibited over the past 10 days.

As everyone knows, last Friday, President Trump issued an executive order banning Muslims from certain countries from entering the United States and callously shutting down the refugee program. What ensued, and I predict will continue to ensue as we speak here today, was nothing short of chaos. Scores and scores of people were detained for hours, including green card holders, children, the elderly, and even Iraqi translators who had helped the United States during the insurgency.

Equally as horrifying as this Muslim ban that is the antithesis of everything we value as Americans is the ineptitude in which such a sweeping policy was implemented. Relevant agencies were not even consulted. In fact, Homeland Security Secretary Kelly, found out about the executive order on the phone while on a Coast Guard plane heading back to Washington. Secretary Mattis was also left off the list of those consulted. Had he been on it, he would have almost certainly expressed the sentiment he expressed during the campaign, mainly that the Muslim ban would cause great damage and send shock waves through the international community.

Like Ms. ESHOO, who spoke earlier, I am a veteran of the Intelligence Committee as well. We serve there together. I can assure you our experience leads us to know—and anyone that is on the Intelligence Committee knows now—that what we are about to experience is a handout to our enemies and will cause additional shock waves in the international community.

The result of this amateur hour roll-out was a Customs and Border Patrol agency that wasn't sure how to even

execute the order. From management on down, no one knew what was going on while scores of people were riddled with fear that their realization of a free and fair life here in the United States was lost forever. People with visas and green cards were held for hours. Will someone please tell me what it means to issue a visa to persons if they cannot utilize the visa?

People were denied access to a lawyer even after a Federal Court order stayed the executive action.

Here is a small sampling of the immediate impact of this Muslim ban: A 5-year-old boy, a U.S. citizen, was detained for several hours. 5 years old—a truer threat to our national security we have never faced. An 88-year-old man and his 83-year-old wife, both wheelchair bound and both possessing green cards, were detained for hours. He is legally blind, and she recently suffered a stroke—detained for hours.

A Ph.D. student at Stony Brook University, who has lived in the United States for 12 years, was detained for more than 24 hours. The mother of an Active Duty United States servicemember was detained for more than 30 hours.

Tell me, what danger do these people pose? What security objective is achieved by detaining them?

I argue none.

I have to agree with Senator ROB PORTMAN when he said what was so plainly obvious to see: "This was an extreme vetting program that wasn't properly vetted."

As thousands arrived at airports across the country to protest the President's executive order and hundreds of lawyers showed up to volunteer their time to write habeas petitions for those so clearly wrongfully detained, President Trump, living in a world all his own, tweeted the following: "All is going well with very few problems."

All is not going well, Mr. President, and there are many problems.

Then he defended the hastily implemented order saying that: "If the ban were announced with a one week notice, the 'bad' would rush into our country during that week. A lot of bad 'dudes' out there!"

This is a stunningly ignorant and offensive statement that reveals to the entire world a person with no grasp of even what the refugee program is or how the visa process works.

Immediately preceding this tweet, the President advised everyone to: "Study the world!"

I encourage him to take his own advice.

Beyond the human toll this foolish and callous policy has inflicted on scores of innocent people, the executive order actually undermines our efforts to defeat terrorism—jeopardizing the very safety the order purports to provide. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, headed by JOHN MCCAIN, along with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, underscored this irony, and I quote their joint statement: "We fear this executive order

will become a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism,” noting further that President Trump’s executive order “may do more to help terrorist recruitment than improve our security.”

So I find it interesting now that the majority of my Republican colleagues in the House, even the ones that voiced opposition to a Muslim ban during the campaign when then-President-elect Trump first proposed it, including our Speaker of the House, are now deafeningly silent.

Instead, Republicans are using their time today not to respond to this chaos-inducing executive order that so clearly violates core American values, but rather to repeal a rule that was actually properly vetted—vetted for 7 years, using the best science and technology available, and following input from the public and leaders in the industry. I caution my friends, the events of today and how you respond to them will be written in the history books tomorrow.

A question emerges from the fog that is the Trump administration’s full frontal attack on our Constitution: What is more important, appeasing a man who is just as likely to tweet insults at you as he is to rush out ill-conceived and horrid executive orders, or protecting our Constitution and the ideals of this great Nation?

The ideals and dedication to the rule of law that have inspired the poor, the tired, and the huddled masses to seek a better and freer life here in the United States. It didn’t begin with Muslims. It began with the Founders of this country, and it was followed by countless others, from Irish, Italians, Polish, Hungarians, Vietnamese, and Chinese, all over this world coming to this country to seek the kind of life that many of our ancestors sought over the course of time and some of our ancestors had no choice but to undertake.

The time to act in the name of short-term political expediency is over. It is time to stand up and do what is right. It is time to protect our Constitution. It is time to defend the idea that we can indeed form a more perfect Union. But we cannot do that with the kind of division that is being sold by this administration, and we cannot do that by spending what appears to be the month of February disapproving executive orders that the previous President issued. It seems to me somehow or another in that fog is going to be the kind of confusion and chaos that we just witnessed this weekend.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the issue at hand and the stream protection rule, there are many points that my friend from Florida brought up. One occurred to me as well: Is this really a midnight rule; or could something that was started in 2008 really be considered as something that was shoved through at the last minute?

I did ask that question, and the answer is a resounding “yes.”

During the process in 2011, some of the reports came out that were leaked that the Department did not see as favorable as it related to jobs and the economy and the negative impact that it would have on that, so they stopped the process, shutting out the States violating the memorandum of understanding that they are required to work with the States on the rule-making process leaving those States with no recourse but to withdraw from the process.

In 2015, this Congress told them to re-engage with the States, which they did to some degree, making it necessary for States to actually pay for the scientific evidence that was necessary for them to be engaged. So there are several problems that cause this to be an issue that we need to address today, and certainly making it a midnight rule, the last thing done as the administration walks out the door, qualifies this as something that we should be considering for many reasons and on many levels.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who is my good friend.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State, whom I have been proud to serve with. I had an opportunity to visit his district, and I know natural resources are extremely important to him. I appreciate his yielding on what is germane to this discussion, which is basically trying to claw back regulations that had no basis in science that essentially were causing harm and taking away good-paying jobs for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the underlying legislation, which disapproves of a midnight regulation that the Obama administration made with just 1 month left in his Presidency.

The stream protection rule negatively targets coal country and will devastate communities that have already been hit hard by job losses and reduced mining activity making sure that America has affordable and reliable energy and electricity.

Pennsylvania is the fifth largest coal producing State and generates roughly 25 percent of its electricity from coal-fired power plants. Coal-fired electricity provides roughly 30,000 jobs in my State, equaling nearly \$8 billion in economic impact.

Although coal continues to be an essential component of our energy mix, this rule duplicates many existing laws while providing very little environmental gain. What the rule does is expands the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement’s regulatory authority. In effect, this Federal agency would overtake the regulatory authorities of individual States.

□ 1300

This makes no sense. States should be able to continue their own regula-

tion of coal production. This is the epitome of a midnight rule that has more to do with empowering the Federal Government at the expense of coal miners’ jobs than it has to do with protecting streams.

The Office of Surface Mining’s own reports show that virtually all coal mines have no offsite impacts. The reports year over year show that coal mines are being safely operated and the lands are being successfully restored thanks to the watchful eyes of the States that regulate 97 percent of the mines in the United States.

This rule does nothing to protect our streams that State and Federal regulators are not already doing. We do not need a one-size-fits-all approach from Washington, which rarely works.

In order to bring real-world thinking back into the regulatory process, we must act quickly to stop this rule. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, both of my colleagues on the other side referred to the rule they seek to disapprove as a midnight rule. Well, I don’t know how you take 7 years of midnights that it took to develop this rule and call it a midnight rule—7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), my very good friend and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose H.J. Res. 38, which would disapprove the Department of the Interior’s stream protection rule.

When the Obama administration announced the final stream protection rule, it was a victory for those who live in coal country. The rule prioritizes the health of our fellow Americans by establishing clear requirements for responsible surface coal mining, especially dangerous mountaintop removal mining.

If this Obama rule were fully enforced, it would protect or restore 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forests over the next two decades. At the time the rule was finalized, I called for stronger stream buffer zone protections, but the announced regulation was undoubtedly a win for human health, clean water, and our environment.

I want to be very clear about what the stream protection rule does. This rule requires that mining companies avoid practices that permanently pollute streams and sources of drinking water, damage forests, and increase flood risks. The rule requires, for the first time, that streams around mining sites be monitored and tested for the presence of toxic chemicals, like lead and arsenic. This rule also requires mining companies to restore polluted streams and replant mined areas with native trees and vegetation.

These provisions ensure that mining companies take responsibility for their actions and act to ensure that coal country communities do not suffer because of destructive mining practices. Now we are debating an ill-conceived resolution which would negate these important advances.

If this rule were to be overturned, American families living near impacted streams and rivers will not be protected from toxic chemicals getting into their water. What is even more appalling is that, because the Congressional Review Act prevents substantially similar regulations from being developed in the future, this joint resolution means that these affected communities might never be protected from the impacts of mining waste in their water.

Protecting our rivers and streams from the damaging impacts of mountaintop removal has been a priority for me, and it is why in past Congresses I have introduced the Clean Water Protection Act, which would end the dumping of mining waste into our country's rivers and streams. I will be reintroducing that legislation this session.

It is unfathomable that congressional Republicans would pass this joint resolution and doom generations of children and families to irreparable harm. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is interesting to me that my colleagues on the other side take offense to this being referred to as a midnight rule. This is actually a midnight rule twice. Let's look at how this thing started.

In 2005, during the Bush administration, 5 years of effort went into codifying how coal mining operations should take place around streams. The last President announced, during his campaign, that he was going to make coal-fired energy financially, economically impossible, thereby launching his war on coal. There was a lawsuit with the Bush-era rule. The Interior Department and the administration settled, paying that settlement out of taxpayer dollars and then launching an effort to rewrite that rule.

In 2011 when we came in, they were planning to release that rule in April of 2011. What took 5 years to codify, they wanted to redo in just 4 months. Not only that, but they left the States out of the equation. The States complained about that. No one in the administration was listening.

When the contractors then told the truth about how many tens of thousands of jobs were going to be lost as a result of this rule, the administration fired the contractor that was doing the work. Not only that, they paid them in full. Now, go figure.

We have been back and forth with the administration asking that the States

be involved, asking that the rule-making process be transparent, asking, if it really had to do with stream protection, why was it talking about and why was it going to be negatively impacting underground coal mining that takes place hundreds, if not thousands, of feet below the surface of the Earth. You answer me that.

So, here we are today, and now we have the Congressional Review Act. I am so grateful that we have the opportunity to set the record straight and to do away with this rule now and forever.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 38 when it comes to the floor this week.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's xenophobic executive order banning Syrian refugees and suspending emigration from certain countries is driven by fear. It demonstrates a callous indifference to human suffering; it ignores the Constitution; and it will not only tarnish our image abroad, but harm our national security. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up my good friend Representative LOFGREN's bill to overturn and defund this dangerous executive order.

Let me be abundantly clear for people watching this debate. The question we are about to decide is: Should we even have a vote on undoing Trump's order? A "no" vote on the previous question will give us the opportunity to overturn this order. A "yes" vote means that the House will do nothing to stop Trump's executive action.

The American people watching this debate should take notice to see how their Representatives vote on this important motion, and they should hold their elected officials accountable. Did your Member of Congress turn a blind eye to Trump's unconstitutional policy by voting "yes," or did your Representative reject this attack on our core American values and vote "no"?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend, to discuss this proposal.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the President's executive order of Friday violates the law, it violates the Constitution, and it violates good sense.

How does it violate the law? Section 202(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act specifically prohibits nationality-based discrimination in the issuance of immigrant visas and other visas. That is what this order did.

Now, the law is clear that individuals who pose a threat to the United States

can—and I should add, should be—barred from the United States; but you can't just legally make a blanket objection based on nationality and, I would add, based on religion. That is what the President's order does. It suspends refugee admission completely for months.

Who are these refugees? Most of the refugees admitted last year were from Burma and the Congo, not from Syria. They are people who have been vetted for years, many of whom are fleeing for their lives and will continue to live in fear.

It does something else. It suspends admission even of legal permanent residents from seven countries, violating their rights to equal protection and to due process.

People want to keep the country safe—we all do; of course, I do—but how does this order keep us safe? Let me just give an example.

General Talib al-Kenani from Iraq commands the elite American-trained counterterrorism forces that have been leading the fight against ISIS for 2 years. His family relocated to the U.S. for safety. He can't visit them anymore. He said this:

I have been fighting terrorism for 13 years and winning. Now my kids are asking: Am I a terrorist? I am a four-star general, and I am banned from entering the United States.

I ask you: How does this advance our safety by barring our allies who are fighting ISIS? It doesn't.

I have got to correct something else. People have said that President Obama had an order in 2011 barring immigrants from Iraq. That is false. We did additional vetting in 2011 because we wanted to make sure that anyone coming in was thoroughly examined. That slowed things down a little bit because there were new procedures, but there was never a halt to admission from those who are our allies in Iraq, those fighting ISIS with us.

I would just like to say that, in addition to violating the law, causing hardship for families trying to visit people in the hospital, permanent residents who are engineers trying to come back to run their companies in Silicon Valley, this order is a gift to ISIS. They are already using it to recruit enemies of our country by saying: America is fighting Islam. As George Bush said when he was President, our argument, our fight is not with Islam. Our fight is with terrorism.

To issue this order with the President's rhetoric saying that we are going to make a distinction on who is admitted to the United States based on their religion is not only illegal, it is contrary to American values and it is contrary to our safety.

So I hope that, instead of doing this anti-environment bill today, we will instead take up H.R. 724. This is a bill that would defund and rescind President Trump's ill-advised order from Friday.

Let me just say this. I would like to issue a formal invitation to every Republican Member of this House to join

me as a cosponsor of this bill. I will be sending out a formal note to each one later today, but you are on notice to please join us.

We as American legislators need to make sure that the rule of law is upheld. Many of our constituents are very uncertain about whether the rule of law is going to survive this Presidency. Help give them faith and hope by cosponsoring this bill.

□ 1315

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the good gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying joint resolution to begin the process of rolling back President Obama's war on coal. That is the rule we are debating today; that is the bill before us, not to be confused with the other issue that is being discussed.

I was proud that, in the last Congress, I was the lead sponsor of the STREAM Act, H.R. 1644, which would have prevented the implementation of a new coal regulation that would have cost upwards of 70,000 good-paying jobs. My legislation passed the House of Representatives in January of 2016, with bipartisan support, and sent a clear message to President Obama's administration that the so-called stream protection rule was bad policy. Unfortunately, my bill never received a vote in the U.S. Senate.

Despite the clear message from Congress, the Obama administration, in the final days, issued a disastrous stream protection rule. Again, he did this as he was leaving the Presidency in the final days before he left office. But don't let the clever name fool you. The new regulation will have far-reaching impacts for the coal industry—an industry, I might add, that provides over 90 percent of the power generation for my home State of West Virginia.

The rule prescribes a one-size-fits-all approach in defiance of common sense and the Federal law. There is no need to rewrite over 400 regulations, as this rule does, other than as a blatant attempt to regulate the coal industry out of business. We cannot allow this rule to move forward, and thus we need to support the rule and the underlying joint resolution of disapproval.

Let us not forget that former President Barack Obama promised that he would bankrupt the coal industry. People are losing their jobs and the dignity that comes with work. Our communities are also suffering. Fewer jobs means less economic investment and less hope.

I encourage my colleagues to visit West Virginia or Appalachia and see firsthand what President Obama's policies have done to our communities. It is heartbreaking to hear the stories and see the faces of struggling families as they try to pay their bills. I stand today with those communities in rolling back the policies that have caused so much harm and pain.

These new regulations would be catastrophic to the coal industry and all of the hardworking American families that depend on coal to keep their energy costs low. The shame of it all is that it is preventable. We must end this war on coal now, and that process begins today.

I made a promise to my constituents of the Second District of West Virginia that I would fight for the coal industry and bring back jobs to my State. Today is the first in many steps this Congress, along with President Donald Trump, will take to make good on the promises we made in November.

Again, I encourage support for the rule and the underlying resolution of disapproval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from wearing communicative badges while under recognition.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be so kind as to tell me how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up Congresswoman LOFGREN's H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on individuals, like the 30-year-old Iranian citizen who entered the U.S. to visit his family in San Francisco, then was detained and transferred to county jail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Washington yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would plead for unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724 to overturn President Trump's refugee ban so that individuals like Hameed Khalid Darweesh, who helped the U.S. military in Iraq and who has a special immigrant visa, won't be detained at JFK Airport for 19 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Washington yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am reiterating my earlier announcement

that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind the President's ban for the sake of our national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for debate.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban so that green card holders like Bessar Yousif, a refugee from Iraq on his way home after getting engaged in Kurdistan, won't get detained in LAX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that President Trump rescind his refugee ban on children like the 12-year-old Yemeni girl, Eman Ali, who was not allowed to board a plane to join her U.S. parents, leaving her in limbo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, as a proud American, I ask to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women like the Yazidi refugee from Iraq whose life is in danger because of her husband's work with Americans and who was refused boarding on a flight to the U.S. out of Erbil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now we are back to unanimous consent. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask this House to bring up the Lofgren bill, H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on Yazidi women from Iraq like Nada, who was not allowed to board a flight and remains separated from her husband, a former interpreter for the U.S. Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentlewoman make a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes, she did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Washington has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS. Am I not permitted to yield a limited amount of time to Members for debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman said he was yielding to the gentlewoman from California for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HASTINGS. In that instance I did. My question and my parliamentary inquiry continuing, Mr. Speaker, is am I permitted to yield a limited amount of time to each Member for the purpose of debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may yield to Members for debate.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on individuals like Dr. Suha Abushamma, a Sudanese doctor at the prestigious Cleveland Clinic, who was denied entry, forced to leave the country, and, therefore, deprived the country of his medical services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask to bring up H.R. 724 to rescind President Trump's refugee ban on persons like Mustafa, who worked on a construction crew on American bases to fortify them and was tortured because of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, bring up H.R. 724, which will rescind President Trump's refugee ban so that family members like Qassim Al Rawi, a 69-year-old Iraqi national, will not be refused boarding on a flight to visit his U.S.-citizen family in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on former Iraqi translators for the United States, like Faud Shareef, who was cleared to settle in Nashville, Tennessee, along with

his family, but stopped before he could board his flight and sent back to harm's way in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's headline in *The Washington Post*: "These Muslim families sought refuge in America's heartland. Now, Trump's visa ban is tearing them apart." One is in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's immigration ban so that students like Maryim can return to classes at the University of Chicago and other students can continue their studies at U.S. colleges and universities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this House bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on children, like 16-year-old Afghani boy Sardar Hussein, who lost his family in a car bomb and now hopes after nearly 2 years of ordeal to get on his flight to America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women like Sara, an Afghani television presenter who fled amidst death threats, had waited for years to be resettled in the U.S., only to have her hopes dashed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip and my good friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and urge that we bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on children, like a 5-year-old that came to Dulles Airport with another family. Her mother was waiting for her, and for 4 hours she was not allowed to see her mother. That is not good policy. It is not good for the safety of our troops. It is not good for the safety of America. Let's pass H.R. 724.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women like Sahar Alghnimi, who came here to care for her elderly mother who had just undergone surgery, only to be detained at O'Hare Airport and ultimately returned to Abu Dhabi.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on families like that of Ghassan Assali, which was en route to Pennsylvania from Syria on approved visas and then turned away and flown back to Qatar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which will rescind President Trump's executive order to ban Muslims. Having been at JFK Airport this weekend, I stand in support of military soldiers who risked their lives and whose family members were unlawfully detained and questioned, even after their service to our country. This is un-American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1330

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban in light of individuals—women like Faten Diab, a Syrian refugee and former charity work whose family had applied for settlement to the United States but will now not be able to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban that prevented South Carolina resident and data scientist Nazanin Zinouri from returning to the United States after visiting her mother in Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on individuals like the student from Afghanistan who was denied entry, sent back, and had her visa canceled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on those who, like 69-year-old Armenouhi Badalyan and 77-year-old Hmayak Shahmirian, are Christian refugees from Iran and have applied for resettlement in the U.S.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban in light of individuals like Jordanian Musa Sharkawi, a cardiologist in Connecticut whose wife is a Syrian doctor and whose family cannot visit her because of the ban.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban and stop the separation of families like that of the Iranian professional whose wife is trapped in Iran and who is considering leaving the United States because of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 seconds to the

gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), my home girl, for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on individuals like Amir Haji-Akbari, a computational statistical physicist from Iran who was just offered an assistant professor job at Yale University.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women like the 77-year-old held at Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport as she tried to see her son and his family for the first time in years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, as a grandfather, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women, like the 69-year-old who was scheduled to visit the U.S. this past weekend to meet her new grandson but is now in limbo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on families like the Syrian refugee family of six who were scheduled to arrive in Cleveland on Tuesday, January 31, but are now blocked indefinitely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind Donald Trump's refugee ban and help unify the family of Farah Usa, a refugee who risked her life for United States forces in Iraq and whose father,

mother, and sister are now barred from entering the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind the President's refugee ban that impacts green card holders like the woman located in Iran with her 3-year-old U.S. citizen daughter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 724 would repeal Trump's overreaching executive order that purports to make America safer. It is time to restore American values. What are the Republicans afraid of? If you support his action, bring up the bill and vote against it. If you don't support his action, we are giving you an opportunity to restore the lawful rights of Congress representing the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, because our Nation has always welcomed refugees and the poor and those who are in need, I don't know why we don't bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on students like the Iranian-born anthropology student who left the U.S. to carry out research and is now likely to be unable to return to defend his thesis. If you do not believe in the ban, bring it up so we can vote against this ban.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this is what a refugee looks like, and I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban and help unify the family of an Iraqi refugee who is now separated indefinitely from her husband and children because of the ban.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend that I serve on the Rules Committee with, for debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my Republican friends to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's appalling and discriminatory refugee ban on women like Samira Asgari, a scientist from Iran who was set to begin a project to study tuberculosis at Harvard Medical School, and was stopped from boarding her flight to the United States. Let us have a vote, let us have a little democracy, in the people's House.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on individuals like the Syrian skin cancer researcher living in Germany whose visa to visit colleagues in Philadelphia has now been revoked. Let us vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, you probably won't be surprised to learn that I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's appalling refugee ban on individuals like the young scientist in Iran who was awarded a fellowship to study cardiovascular medicine at Harvard, but whose visa has now been indefinitely suspended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's outrageous ban on Muslims so that the San Fernando Valley's own Darrius Hicks, an American citizen, can be reunited with his wife, who is a humanitarian worker working with Afghan war victims in Iran. She has been denied even the chance to schedule a visa interview at our embassy in Abu Dhabi.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's unconstitutional Muslim ban that led to a Stanford University graduate student who has lived in the United States since 1993 getting handcuffed and then detained at JFK airport for 5 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's cold and callous refugee ban on travelers like the UK resident who holds an Iranian passport, was due to fly back to Glasgow via New York, and had her transit visa revoked.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban and help unify the family of Muktar and his wife, who spent 20 years in a refugee camp after fleeing Somalia, and will continue to be separated from their children who still live in the camp.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban in light of mothers like Ran Chauhan, who arrived in the U.S. 5 years ago and is going through the naturalization process, but is separated from her sister and two children who are set to arrive in mid February.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President

Trump's misguided refugee ban. Scheduled to arrive today in Toledo from war-torn Iraq was a fully vetted mother and her three young daughters, one of whom is less than a year old. They are forced to remain in Tunisia with their futures very uncertain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's tragic refugee ban that would have barred women like the Syrian violinist who has performed at the White House and who is worried about her family that remain in Aleppo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban that keeps apart families like that of Luca Freschi, who had planned to move to Harvard Medical School in March but whose Iranian wife would not be able to join him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 724, which would rescind President Trump's refugee ban on women like Shadi Heidarifar, a philosophy student at the University of Tehran who was accepted to New York University, but is now unsure if she will be able to attend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, that unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1345

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, with the Members who have come here and asked for unanimous consent and with its being denied by virtue of the gentleman from Washington's not agreeing to the unanimous consent and with the notion in mind that the period for debate is what is to be recognized, my

question is: Do the people who did come here and seek unanimous consent—although it was not accepted—have the opportunity to insert a statement in the RECORD that signifies their intentions with reference to the matter at hand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may insert remarks under general leave.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes and 55 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader of the Republican Conference.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Since the beginning of this Congress, we have devoted ourselves most prominently to a single goal: making Washington work for the people again.

There is one thing here in Washington that consistently stands against our people, our economy, and our Constitution: the Federal bureaucracy.

These agencies, bureaus, and departments—so numerous that nobody even knows how many there are—spend their lives thinking up new rules, and the rules they produce weigh down businesses, destroy jobs, and limit Americans' rights. Career bureaucrats who can't be voted out of office wield punishing authority with little to no accountability. They are agents of the status quo, and the revolving door of Federal employees moving to lobbying arms and consulting firms breed thousands of regulations that enrich the connected and powerful, sometimes at the great expense of the average American. This is the swamp. This is what opposes the people, and we are draining it.

In recent weeks, this House has already started its two-part plan to strip the bureaucracy of its power. We started to change the structure in Washington by passing the REINS Act and the Regulatory Accountability Act. This week, we begin part two: targeting specific rules and stripping them from the books.

There has been no industry in America that has been more regulated than energy. We are going to use the Congressional Review Act to repeal the stream protection rule that could destroy tens of thousands of mining jobs and put up to 64 percent of our country's coal reserves off limits.

Then we will take on President Obama's 11th hour BLM methane emissions requirement. The oil and gas industry in America has already drastically reduced methane emissions even while increasing output, and the EPA already has the authority to regulate air emissions. Instead of helping

the environment, this rule could cost America's energy industry up to \$1 billion by 2025 and force smaller operations, especially out West, to shut down and lay off employees. So, this Friday, the House will get rid of it.

We will also take the ax to the SEC disclosure rule, which—now, if you can believe it—targets publicly traded American energy companies with even more regulatory compliance while it lets foreign companies off the hook. Washington should put American companies first, not put them at a disadvantage to their foreign competitors.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just energy, which would be bad enough; but under President Obama, the bureaucracy has even threatened our basic constitutional rights. A new rule from the Social Security Administration would increase scrutiny on up to 4.2 million disabled Americans if they attempt to purchase firearms. For the completely unrelated circumstance of having someone help manage your finances, Social Security recipients could be kept from exercising their Second Amendment rights. In an affront to due process, the bureaucracy has even attempted to blacklist from Federal contracts any business that is accused of violating labor laws, and that could be before the company has a chance to defend itself in court.

Every single one of these will be gone. With a vote in the House, a vote in the Senate, and President Trump's signature, we will get rid of every one of these job-killing and destructive regulations. The House is always at the service of the people. Now we are making the bureaucracy serve the people, too.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I inform the gentleman from Washington that I have no further requests for time and I am prepared to close.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; so, yes, I am prepared to close.

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

The majority leader just got through saying all of the things they are getting ready to do to drain the swamp. My feeling about what is happening—and I am speaking for myself—is they may very well drain the swamp, but if you take out the alligators and you put in crocodiles and you put in snakes, you have just made the swamp that much more dangerous to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the cavalier nature by which my friends across the aisle approach the awesome responsibility of governing is as disturbing as it is disappointing. They all own this now. They are in charge. Although I may understand the emotive desire to turn things on their head, they all would be wise to come to the realization sooner rather than later that their actions affect real people. All they have to do is just see what transpired this past weekend.

The children, the elderly, the students who are waiting in airports

across our country who are wishing to flee their oppressors or who are simply returning to their lives here at home are real people. They heard them being identified in the denied unanimous consent requests of my colleagues who came forward here. The children, the elderly, and all of the other folks who have to live in environments that are less clean and that are more likely to make them sick because of their flippancy approach here today are real people. To be taken seriously, they must act seriously. Within that context, I would have to surmise that they all would be judged and found wanting.

To truly convey the devastating consequences of what has happened these past few days, I could quote from one of the Founding Fathers about the ideal of freedom from religious persecution; or I could recite for them the inscription on the Statue of Liberty, which has guided and inspired generations of immigrants and refugees as they have come here to seek better lives for themselves and their families; or I could quote from Luke 10:25 wherein Jesus tells the parable of the Good Samaritan. I will not.

Instead, I will leave them with the words of Dr. Amir Heydari, a bariatric surgeon and United States citizen who has lived in the United States for nearly 40 years and who was detained for questioning this past weekend:

"I wanted to live somewhere that celebrated freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, all of these kinds of things. That's what everyone in the world thinks about the USA, and unfortunately, when these types of actions are taken, the image is not the same anymore."

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying measure.

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

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

I would just like to take a minute to remind the American people and my friends across the aisle that we are here today, as the minority leader said, to begin the process of unwinding the burdensome regulations that are truly stifling job creation and hurting our friends and our families in each and every one of our neighborhoods across the country.

Many from the other side have tried to distract with unrelated issues. I just want to be clear that the rule today does not address immigration in any way and that none of their requests went through the regular and bipartisan process to clear such requests.

So let's focus on why we are here. We are here because we must take a firm stand against the overly burdensome and restrictive regulations that have been issued in the waning days of the previous administration. By passing this CRA, we can rescind the final stream protection rule, which the OSM produced without input from the States—responsible for enforcing mining regulations—and which disregards

existing regulations on both the State and the Federal levels that have proven to be effective.

This regulation will have devastating effects on mining communities across the country and will lead to significant job losses and higher electricity costs—all while weakening U.S. energy security for decades. The stream protection rule will drastically reduce our access to coal and our ability to develop new clean coal technologies, which will result in reduced domestic energy protection and in tens of thousands of lost jobs in coal-producing States as well as in industries across the country that are reliant on this energy. If we fail to pass the underlying bill, the rule's devastating impacts will be felt far and wide in our great land as approximately 78,000 mining jobs will be lost, which is in addition to the tens of thousands of mining jobs that have already been lost in the last 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, coal is essential to the U.S. economy. It provides affordable energy that accounts for almost 40 percent of the Nation's electricity supply—almost 20 percent in the gentleman's home State of Florida. Because of its abundance, reliability, and affordability, electricity generated from coal is generally 30 percent cheaper than other alternative energy sources. Additionally, at current consumption rates, our country has more than 250 years of remaining coal reserves, ensuring that we will have energy security here at home for generations to come.

Passing H.J. Res. 38 will protect American jobs and families from yet another burdensome regulation that has failed to follow the basic tenets of transparency, inclusivity, and cooperation with stakeholders, cooperating States, and, most importantly, the American people.

Now is the time for Congress to overturn this unparalleled executive overreach and implement policies that protect communities that have been long forgotten by the former administration. The CRA was designed for this exact purpose, and we now have a unique opportunity to pass this legislation through both Chambers and see it signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for the consideration of an important resolution that will ensure that mining communities and hardworking families are not pressed by another crippling Federal regulation. I believe this rule and the underlying legislation are strong measures that are important to our country's future. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 70 and the underlying joint resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 70 and the joint resolution for which it would provide consideration, H.J. Res. 38, expressing disapproval of the Stream Protection Rule submitted by the Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

The Stream Protection Rule is a critical update to a decades-old regulation that provides clear and established requirements for responsible surface coal mining while protecting vital community health and economic opportunity across the United States.

The rule, crafted in an extensive and transparent public process, includes reasonable reforms to avoid and minimize impacts on surface water, groundwater, fish, wildlife, and other natural resources. Grounded in sound, peer-reviewed scientific evidence and modern technological advancements, the rule modernizes 33-year old regulations to keep pace with modern mining techniques and incorporates in its guidance a broader scientific understanding of the deleterious effects caused by unmitigated surface coal mining activity.

During the development of this critical rule, the Department of Interior received over 150,000 public comments, hosted 15 open houses and public meetings, and engaged in broad outreach to stake holders nationwide. This rule was carefully developed and thoroughly considered with all stakeholders provided a seat at the table.

Ultimately, H.J. Res. 38 would undermine the Stream Protection Rule and begin the process to undue monumental steps in the right direction to protect the health, well-being, and economic prosperity of countless Americans living near coal mining sites. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject H. Res. 70, providing for the consideration of the harmful H.J. Res. 38. Any effort to undermine this important health, economic, and environmental protection results in a lose-lose situation for the American public and I oppose it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 70 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 724) to provide that the Executive Order entitled "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States" (January 27, 2017), shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the Executive Order, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 724.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In *Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1400

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ENSURING RELIABLE AIR SERVICE IN AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 276) a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure reliable air service in American Samoa, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RELIABLE AIR SERVICE IN AMERICAN SAMOA.

Section 40109(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) review the exemption at least every 30 days (or, in the case of exemptions that are necessary to provide and sustain air transportation in American Samoa between the islands of Tutuila and Manu’a, at least every 180 days), to ensure that the unusual circumstances that established the need for the exemption still exist.”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) RENEWAL OF EXEMPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may renew an exemption (including renewals) under this subsection for not more than 30 days.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—An exemption that is necessary to provide and sustain air transportation in American Samoa between the islands of Tutuila and Manu’a, may be renewed for not more than 180 days.

“(4) CONTINUATION OF EXEMPTIONS.—An exemption may continue for not more than 5 days after the unusual circumstances that established the need for the exemption cease.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 276.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 276, as amended. This bill will improve transportation in American Samoa by making air service between its islands more reliable and predictable.

Specifically, the bill streamlines a burdensome Federal regulatory process that artificially inhibits economic growth and jobs on the islands. The Senate unanimously passed similar legislation in the last Congress, and I am hopeful they will join with us this year in addressing this issue.

I want to thank the sponsor of the bill, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN), for her tireless efforts on behalf of her constituents and for working with us to bring a bill that benefits so many of them to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 276.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 276, as amended, introduced by the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN), which will ensure reliable air service into American Samoa.

American Samoa is situated in the center of the South Pacific, about 2,500 miles south of Hawaii. Its nearest neighboring islands are at least 500 miles away, and the territory is more than 7,000 miles from where we stand today.

This remote location already makes export and travel difficult and costly. Complicating matters more is the fact that the current cabotage laws prohibit foreign air carriers from carrying passengers between the islands, except in certain emergency situations.

The Department of Transportation has authority to issue waivers in such emergency cases, but the waivers are good for only 30 days. A foreign airline that is otherwise fit to provide service between American Samoa's islands is, therefore, forced to apply monthly for a waiver.

H.R. 276 would remove this burden by permitting DOT to grant the cabotage waiver for up to 6 months. This change ensures that domestic air transportation is provided and sustained between the islands, benefitting both the people and the economy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the

gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Subcommittee Chairman LOBIONDO, Ranking Members DEFAZIO and LARSEN, and their staff for the effort and work they put in to quickly see this measure through this committee. They do an excellent job, and it is always encouraging to work with such bright people. I also want to thank Leader MCCARTHY and his staff for their assistance in getting this measure to the floor. I look forward to working under their leadership to bring prosperity to the American people, including those in the territories.

Mr. Speaker, the people of American Samoa desperately need improvement to their access to reliable transportation between the islands of Tutuila and Manu’a. The remote Manu’a islands are losing residents at an alarming pace, mostly due to the lack of reliable transportation; and it is causing a great hardship on the families and businesses who reside on these islands which lie 60 miles from the main island of Tutuila.

Also, the lack of reliable transportation poses a severe health risk to those who need emergency medical care, as the only hospital in American Samoa is in Tutuila.

My bill, H.R. 276, will help alleviate this issue by easing some of the burdensome red tape causing the issue, and I look forward to seeing it signed into law by the President.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 276, a bill to provide more reliable air service to the people of American Samoa for air travel within American Samoa.

The Northern Mariana Islands are similar to American Samoa in many ways. Although the large majority of our population resides on Saipan, I have also several thousand constituents residing on the islands Tinian and Rota. We are fortunate that air travel between these islands is possible with the presence of commercial air travel.

Unfortunately, in American Samoa, there are no U.S. carriers operating a route between Tutuila and Manu’a. So Polynesian Airlines, based out of Samoa, is the only carrier operating that route.

H.R. 276, introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN), presents a commonsense approach to cut red tape and allow regular flights to continue between these islands. It would help the people of American Samoa conduct business, visit relatives, and access health care.

It has my full support, and I ask the House to pass this commonsense legislation.

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