



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 2018

No. 116

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 11, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

FAMILY SEPARATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the court-ordered deadline for the Trump administration to reunite more than 100 children under 5 years old with their families.

The administration has failed to meet this deadline, and that is shameful. Dozens of babies and toddlers remain in government custody with no idea of when they will see their parents again.

As a mom, I am outraged. This administration is failing to comply with a court-ordered deadline.

But what is this really about, babies, toddlers, and young children? Ask any pediatrician. This is harmful, and every day creates more harm to these innocent children.

This administration is saying they were forced to separate families when, in fact, it was their deliberate zero-tolerance policy, their strategy that forcibly took children out of their parents' arms, and it has always been within their power to stop this coldhearted and inhumane madness.

On Monday, I met with Latino and immigrant community leaders in Oregon to hear from them firsthand about how this administration's actions are harming families and communities. They spoke of unprecedented fear, of families torn apart, and of children afraid to go to school. They spoke about why people come to the United States in the first place: to make a better life for themselves and for their children.

Miriam Corona from Yamhill County said that there is no greater gift of love than to leave everything you know for your children's future. That is why my grandparents got on a boat in 1921 and crossed the ocean from Italy for the American Dream. It is why many people are now fleeing terrible violence in Central America and in Mexico to make a better life for themselves and their children and, oftentimes, to save their children's lives.

That is what we stand for in this country of the United States of America: a better life, a peaceful life free from violence, and a better future for the next generation. As a parent, that is what I want for my children, and as a Member of Congress, it is what I want for everyone in our community.

The Trump administration's actions contradict these fundamental values. We are better than this. I continue to

demand that the administration reunite all separated children with their parents—not later, now. This is a court order, not a suggestion.

If the problem is that these agencies are understaffed, I will come over to the agency. I will go over to Health and Human Services to help. I am sure many of my colleagues will join me.

Mr. Speaker, when the families are reunited, our work is not done. We must fix our broken immigration system. It is long past time to vote on a comprehensive, humane, and compassionate immigration reform bill. That is what Oregonians want, and it is what the majority of people in this country want.

RECOGNIZING EAGLE SCOUT TOMMY FULFORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tommy Fulford of O'Fallon, Illinois, for winning the National Eagle Scout Service Project of the Year Award for the central region.

This project was a year in the making. Tommy took a dirt-filled storage room dating back to 1904 in the basement of the O'Fallon, Illinois, History Museum and created an exhibit illustrating the long history of coal mining in southern Illinois. The room was designed to give visitors the feel of being in an actual mine.

I visited the exhibit last month. Mr. Speaker, coming from mining roots myself, I can tell you Tommy's project hit very close to home.

To put things in perspective, Eagle Scouts around the country and their volunteers completed almost 8.5 million hours of service toward their Eagle projects last year. This works out to 150 hours per project. Tommy and his 18 volunteers dedicated 934 hours of service to complete his coal mining exhibit.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6043

Tommy, I applaud you, and I appreciate your dedication and hard work. I know you have a bright future ahead of you.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, in January, I came to this well to urge support for bipartisan legislation I introduced with my Illinois colleague, Mr. SCHNEIDER. Our bill proposed a Federal grant program to improve security at our schools and protect our children.

Since then, our legislation passed the House and the Senate and was signed into law by President Trump. Because of Members' bipartisan support, I am proud to say these grants are now available to local communities.

Please urge local officials in our districts to visit cops.usdoj.gov for more information on how to apply for up to \$500,000 in grants through the school violence prevention program. However, the application deadline for this fiscal year is July 30, so time is of the essence.

We have advanced safety technology in banks, office buildings, and retail locations. There is no reason we shouldn't have that same technology in our schools to protect our children.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I am proud to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. I am not proud to stand here today for the reasons that I shall articulate.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government separates children from their parents, indeed, mothers from their babies, it does not look right.

Some may argue that it is right because of various laws and legislation that might exist, but it doesn't look right for this country, the country that believes in liberty and justice for all. It doesn't look right for the United States of America to separate babies from their mothers.

Where is the moral compass?

There ought to be an inner voice within us that says there is something wrong here. We are taking a baby from the baby's mother, and we are going to put the baby in a location separate and apart from the mother. The baby needs the mother. The mother is there to nurture the baby.

How can we do this in good conscience?

We live in a world where it is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. And this doesn't look right to the world.

I have gone to visit these children. I went to Brownsville. I saw the children. They are caring for the children, but the missing element, the most important thing that these children need, was not there: their parents.

I went to three other sites before going to Brownsville and, Mr. Speaker, I, as a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, went to a site in my congressional district, and I went to other sites. I could not see the children, and I was asked to leave the premises. I behaved in an orderly fashion. I had two forms of identification. But not only could I not see the children, I was asked to leave the property.

There is no transparency. This is the Federal Government holding children and not allowing open access to these children by Members of Congress.

It is not enough for things to be right; they must also look right. When the Members of the Congress of the United States of America cannot see the children who have been secreted in various locations around the country and separated from their parents, not only does this not look right, it isn't right.

At some point on this infinite continuum that we call time, we will all have to account for our time. At some point, when the omnipotent, the omnipresent, and omniscient are one, we will have to answer to what is happening to these children today. These children belong to all of us in the sense that they are children of our world, and we must answer and account for what is happening today.

So I stand here in the well, a proud Member of Congress and proud to be an American, but sad to know that we have not done enough to reunite these children with their parents.

Mr. Speaker, if you separate children from their parents, if you take babies from their mothers, then you must have a plan to reunite them. When you do not, you are failing not only those parents, but you are failing the future of a great country, because it gives us the appearance of not caring for people who are in harm's way who have come asking for help. It gives us the appearance of not being that Good Samaritan who not only helped the person who was in harm's way who had been beset upon by thieves, it gives us the appearance of not being that Good Samaritan who said: I am going to help you. I am going to take you to the inn. I am going to leave; I am coming back; and I will pay more if you need more.

This is the United States of America. We can do better.

LAKE OKEECHOBEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of this body. I would like every Member of this body to think about this: What would you do if one of your neighbors each and every day was taking their garbage and throwing it over your fence into your yard? What would you do if that were the case?

In the case of my community, it is not just the garbage of neighboring

communities that enters its way into our community, it is toxic water pollution.

So if somebody throwing garbage over your fence would infuriate you as an individual, then I would ask you to imagine how you would feel if your neighbor was knowingly poisoning the kids in your backyard, your children?

I don't think that I know of words. I don't think I know of a four-letter word that would describe this for me. I don't know of an emoji that I could text anybody. I don't know an emotion that I could use to adequately describe the feeling of having my community poisoned, knowingly and willingly, year after year after year.

Now, the World Health Organization says that any amount greater than 10 parts per billion microcystin algae is poison for humans and that it causes everything from nausea to liver disease. That is a pretty broad spectrum.

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection just reported that the level released into our waters is more than 150 parts per billion.

Let me say that one more time.

The World Health Organization said that anything greater than 10 parts per billion is poison. The water being released into my community that plays no role in producing this toxic water is being exposed to water that is more than 150 parts per billion, 15 times what is considered harmful to human health.

□ 1015

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is planning to resume its poisoning operations later this week. As a result of that, I would like to ask three things:

Number one, to the Department of Defense, who is currently conducting a systemwide review of its policies: Do not release one more drop of this poison water into my community, into Florida's Treasure Coast, into the epicenter of population for hundreds of thousands of people. Our community did not create the problem or the conditions leading to this poison, and we must not be forced to have the health of each of our citizens put at risk as a result of someone else's garbage being thrown into our yard—or, rather, by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers releasing it into our backyard.

Number two, I would ask this of our President: The situation has resulted in a state of emergency in years past, and the Governor has already declared a state of emergency for Florida and a number of counties, including for Martin and St. Lucie Counties. I call for a Federal state of emergency to be declared right now.

I also ask this. Previous administrations had this request come before them, and those administrations did nothing. I would ask this of our administration: Bring in the cavalry. Bring in every bit of water cleanup operation you can find that can be yielded by FEMA, by the Coast Guard, by Fish and Wildlife, by anybody else that can

go out there and clean this poison, these toxins out of our waterways.

Number three, to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: Federal court cases demand that everything—all the water that goes south of Lake Okeechobee, where this toxic water stems from—not be exposed to anything greater than 10 parts per billion of phosphorous. That actually slows the rate of water flow to the south, where that water actually belongs, where God designed that water to go. Yet my community is getting toxic water with parts greater than 150 parts per billion, which is, as I said, 15 times greater than what is safe for human contact. That is not equitable. That is not right.

So I would ask that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who has the emergency authority granted to them under section 7-13 when there are pollution emergencies: Use that authority now to stop poisoning my community, to protect the hundreds of thousands of people on the Treasure Coast of Florida, and send that dirty, toxic water south.

STOP THE GOVERNMENT FROM SPYING ON AMERICAN CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, millions of data sheets spit out of the printer inside a thick-walled, secure facility. Across the top are Americans' names, a list of phone numbers dialed, the time and date called, and the frequency in which they called or texted a person.

"Who is doing this?" you might ask. A criminal organization? A private investigator? Who is intentionally stalking and gathering data on innocent American citizens without their knowledge?

Well, it is not a nefarious organization operating behind closed doors. It is not the Russians. It is the spying eyes of the United States Federal Government.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the government authorized once-secret programs by the NSA to collect information on bad actors, primarily terrorists, who wish to create mayhem. They were terrorists overseas.

As the subcommittee chairman of Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, I agree that we should go after terrorists. Our government should use techniques they have on those people who wish to destroy America and find out what those terrorists are doing.

But despite the overall intention of the law, the program has been corrupted. Not only does the NSA collect information on terrorists, which they should do, but it collects data on ordinary American citizens, including communications, emails, and text messages.

The government does not have a specific Fourth Amendment warrant to collect and search this data on Ameri-

cans, but it does it anyway. The Fourth Amendment says the warrantless search and seizure is unconstitutional without a probable cause warrant. But the government ignores the Constitution.

This sensitive information is placed into a searchable database by the government, a secret database. Sometimes the government decides to go into that database that was seized without a Fourth Amendment warrant and checks to see how many times a name comes up. They take that information and do a reverse search, checking to see if the citizen's identifying information is in the database.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is done by our government on Americans, in secret, without a Fourth Amendment warrant.

For years, the NSA has refused to provide data on the number of Americans swept up in their secret searches. I have advocated for years that the NSA level with Americans, our government, and the Congress as to how much information they are seizing.

Several months ago, the House voted for a flawed FISA bill, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which, unfortunately, reauthorized the warrantless surveillance of American citizens. The only good thing to come out of this spying bill is a hard-fought provision releasing the numbers of Americans wrapped up in government spying. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they paint a grim picture for the privacy of Fourth Amendment protections.

In 2017 alone, the NSA unconstitutionally gathered data on 7,512 U.S. persons, a search without a probable cause warrant. This is up from 5,288 in 2016.

According to a previous report by The Washington Post, 90 percent of the account holders whose communications were collected were not targets. That means the government was just fishing around in the data they had collected and searching information on Americans without a warrant.

Privacy must not be forsaken on the false altar of national security. As a former judge, I am very concerned about the loss of our Fourth Amendment right of privacy in the United States based on this unconstitutional action by the NSA.

The Fourth Amendment is sacred to this country and to the Founders who drafted it. It is up to Congress to uphold Americans' Fourth Amendment rights. We must reform an article called 702 to require that if the government wants to look at the data that was seized on Americans, they do it with a search warrant, based on the Fourth Amendment. If they don't have a search warrant based on the Fourth Amendment, then they cannot seize and go through that information.

It is a very simple concept, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that Congress would act to stop our government from spying on American citizens in

the name of national security. It is unconstitutional.

And that is just the way it is.

TWILIGHT WISH FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that recently celebrated its 15th anniversary.

The Twilight Wish Foundation, based in Doylestown, seeks to grant the wishes of low-income senior citizens. These wishes can be big or small, ranging from meeting Philadelphia Eagles players to the purchasing of a new pair of eyeglasses.

As a society, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon all of us as both public servants and citizens to support programs and support policies that protect our senior citizens. I commend the work done by the Twilight Wish Foundation, and I applaud the leadership of founder and Chairman of the Board Cass Forkin. I would also like to thank Vice President Robin Kardane; Director of Community Relations Mary Farrell; and Director of Wish Management Michelle Bowren, for all their incredible work for our community.

RECOGNIZING BOB CONSULMAGNO

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who recently broke his fourth world record.

Bob Consulmagno of Morrisville successfully broke the record for the most outstanding ab wheel rollouts while wearing a 40-pound weight vest. Making this feat more impressive is that Bob, a retired marine, completed this major accomplishment to raise awareness of mental illness.

Diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and bipolar disorder, Bob turned to sports and physical training to battle mental illness. Using his athleticism to garner attention to those who struggle from mental illness, Bob hopes to end the stigma with which it is often associated and to promote treatment for military veterans.

I am proud to call Bob my constituent, and I am thankful for his service to our community and for turning challenging experiences into positive and educational engagements.

RECOGNIZING THE KAITLIN MURPHY FOUNDATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is working tirelessly to assist those struggling with drug addiction.

The Kaitlin Murphy Foundation, established to honor the life and memory of Kaitlin Murphy of Doylestown, partners with law enforcement agencies and organizations with similar missions to provide resources to those suffering from substance abuse, along with their families.

Some of these organizations include the HEART Program, which serves to rehabilitate females suffering from addiction at the Bucks County Correctional Facility; the Moyer Foundation's Camp Mariposa; and Bucks County Police Assisting in Recovery. For their work, the Kaitlin Murphy Foundation recently received a grant from Warrington Cares, the employee charity of Warrington Township.

I am proud to represent such thoughtful and generous people in our community, and I applaud the work of the Kaitlin Murphy Foundation and Warrington Cares, and I will continue to do my part here in Washington to end this public health crisis.

Lastly, I would like to extend my appreciation to Kaitlin's parents, Tim and Pat Murphy of Doylestown; Kaitlin's brother, Sean; and the organization's president, Annemarie Murphy of Warrington for all their work for our community.

EQUALITY FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, I was joined by more than 40 Members of this House in introducing H.R. 6246, the Puerto Rico Admission Act of 2018. That number has since grown to almost 50 Members. This is truly a bipartisan bill that sets forth a transition process that will result in the formal admission of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union, on an equal footing and in true permanent union with the rest of the States.

H.R. 6246 would constitute Congress' long overdue response to the citizens of Puerto Rico who, twice in the past 6 years, have overwhelmingly voted by 97 percent and 61 percent margins expressing their political will to join their fellow Americans as equal in our Union.

After 120 years under the U.S. flag and 101 years as American citizens, Puerto Ricans remain disenfranchised and trapped in a second-class status that denied us the same rights and responsibilities as our fellow citizens in the States.

Puerto Ricans do not enjoy a democratic form of government at the national level because we can't vote for the President and the Vice President of the United States. We don't have a voting representation here in this Congress that every day passes laws that affect us and affect our future. That lack of a democratic form of government at the local level is due to Congress passing PROMESA in 2016, severely limiting the powers of the duly-elected government of the island.

This lack of full participation in the Federal Government that enacts the laws and the rules that Puerto Ricans live under, combined with the absolute power of the U.S. Congress under our

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution to treat us equally under those laws has proven to be a fundamental limitation on the fulfillment of our potential as a people.

The combination of these inequities, which were unmasked and further exacerbated by last year's historic hurricanes, has led to incoherent and arbitrary Federal policies that have limited the island's opportunities to maximize our full economic potential.

I am certain that not even one of my stateside colleagues in this Congress would accept a territorial status like Puerto Rico's for their own constituents. It is my hope that all of them will recognize and respect that the people of Puerto Rico are no longer willing to accept it either.

I also trust that my colleagues will credit Puerto Rico for aspiring to have the first-class citizenship and equality they have been denied for over a century, with the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow citizens in the States.

My constituents might not have a vote in the government that makes their national laws, but they have a voice. They made that voice heard loud and clear not just once, but twice.

□ 1030

Every Member who supports H.R. 6246 will send a clear message that he or she is standing up for a powerful principle: that the people of Puerto Rico are American citizens who have, in war and peace, made countless contributions and greatly enriched the life of this Nation for generations.

More than 250,000 Puerto Ricans have served in our military forces and bravely fought in every conflict since the Great War, side by side with the citizens of other States, defending our democratic values all over the world. Yet, they are denied the right to vote for their Commander in Chief.

A disproportionately large number of them have made the ultimate sacrifice in battle. When they do, their caskets are flown back to this country, draped in an American flag that contains just 50 stars, but none of those represent them and represent Puerto Rico.

Furthermore, those who are fortunate to return to the island and join the ranks of the more than 100,000 veterans living on the island encounter a system that discriminates against them and treats them as second-class citizens.

Furthermore, because of these longstanding inequities, in the last 10 years alone, more than 400,000 Puerto Ricans have relocated to the States in the search for equality.

That is the equality we are looking for in this bill, a truly bipartisan bill that will let Puerto Rico become the 51st State of the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this bill and acknowledge the situation in Puerto Rico and let us become first-class U.S. citizens.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 requires most SEC registrants to file a form 10Q quarterly report with the SEC. The form 10Q includes condensed financial information and other data prepared by a company and reviewed by independent auditors.

Although technology has evolved rapidly over the years, the form 10Q used today was adopted in 1950. My legislation, H.R. 5970, the Modernizing Disclosures for Investors Act, requires the Securities and Exchange Commission, the SEC, to report to Congress the costs and benefits of form 10Q and recommendations for decreasing costs while increasing transparency and efficiency of quarterly financial reporting.

Specifically, my bill requires the SEC to look at emerging growth companies that are particularly susceptible to the burdens and complexities associated with current reporting requirements. In recent years, annual and quarterly reporting requirements have grown in size and complexity, making it more difficult for investors to determine relevant information, often leaving them overwhelmed and unable to make sound investment decisions.

Furthermore, some companies believe that current reporting requirements have become a barrier to registering as publicly traded companies, as noted by a 2011 report by the IPO Task Force. The report, which was prompted by the JOBS Act of 2012, found that 92 percent of public company leaders said that the administrative burden of public reporting was a significant challenge to completing an IPO and becoming a public company.

Finally, I would like to note that my legislation is timely. At a recent SEC oversight hearing, Chairman Clayton highlighted in his testimony that: "We should regularly review whether we have disclosure requirements that are outdated, duplicative, or can otherwise be improved."

In addition, just last week, the SEC finalized a rule expanding the definition of smaller reporting companies, which will allow them to be eligible for scaled disclosures.

Before I conclude, I want to take a minute to thank Congressman GOTTHEIMER for his willingness to work across the aisle and to get this bill to the finish line. With the passage of H.R. 5970 just last evening, we have provided yet another example of how Congress can work together in a bipartisan manner.

IMPROVING CHOICES IN HEALTHCARE COVERAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, the cost of health insurance is on the minds of many Americans this summer, and it should be.

Nearly half a million people in North Carolina buy their health insurance on the ObamaCare marketplace. The average price for these plans continues to go up each and every year.

This wouldn't be as much of an issue if there were many options to choose from, but, unfortunately, there are not. Blue Cross, the only insurer that is still in all 100 counties in our State, announced that they were raising rates by an average of nearly 19 percent going into 2017. Then they raised them again this year by over 14 percent. I expect them to do the same next year, the year after that, and in coming years after that.

It is clear to me that the individual mandate didn't actually lower the cost of health insurance, and bailing out big insurance companies certainly didn't help either.

Mr. Speaker, as you know very well, we need an off-ramp from ObamaCare. We need a solution that allows for more competition, because competition drives down prices and allows people to purchase health insurance without going bankrupt.

While we continue to work toward getting a full repeal and replace on the President's desk, I believe we should also pass a simple bill right now that would provide millions of Americans a way to buy more affordable health insurance.

Short-term, limited-duration medical plans are designed to provide coverage for a limited time when someone is between health insurance policies—individuals who are between jobs, for example—but these plans are also exempt from having to abide by ObamaCare's regulatory regime.

The Obama administration was concerned with these plans becoming attractive alternatives to ObamaCare. So before they left office in 2016, they issued a regulation that defined these short-term policies as those that are less than 3 months long.

I believe strengthening these types of plans would be a huge step in the right direction. That is why, last month, I introduced a simple bill called the Improving Choices in Health Care Coverage Act.

This bill would do two simple things. It would allow people to stay on these less expensive, short-term medical plans for as long as 364 days, and it would allow them to renew these plans for multiple years.

According to the American Action Forum, which looked at different findings from the Congressional Budget Office, the Urban Institute, and the Commonwealth Fund, there seems to be a consensus that these plans would be attractive to consumers because of their low premiums, and, thus, enrollment would likely be into the millions.

I hear from constituents every time I go back home that their monthly pre-

miums are way too high. Mr. Speaker, this bill is one way we can relieve some of their financial stress. With looming announcements by big insurance companies that they are again going to be increasing premiums, the time to act is now.

RUSSIA'S MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the first Gulf war many years ago because our leaders at that time said Saddam Hussein was the greatest threat since Hitler and told us all about Hussein's powerful, elite troops.

I then saw these same elite troops surrender to CNN camera crews and empty tanks. I realized then, and many times since, that the threats had been and continue to be greatly exaggerated. For this and many other reasons, I voted against the second Gulf war in 2002.

Most of these threats are more about money and power than they are about real danger to the U.S. They also seem to be because many of our leaders seem to be a little too eager to go to war and want to be new Winston Churchills and prove how tough they are, how patriotic, and how they are great leaders. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not patriotic at all to send young Americans to fight very unnecessary wars.

With these thoughts as background, I would like to read part of conservative syndicated columnist Eric Margolis' most recent column.

First, let me say that President Trump is correct in saying that NATO countries should not continue to expect the U.S. to pay for their defense needs.

Mr. Margolis' column, in part, is as follows:

Germany is reported to have less than 20 operational tanks. Canada's armed forces appear to be smaller than the New York City Police Department.

But the Europeans ask, "Defense against whom?" The Soviet Union was a huge threat back in the Cold War when the mighty Red army had 55,000 tanks pointed west. Today, Russia's land and naval power has evaporated. Russia has perhaps 5,500 main battle tanks in active service and a similar number in storage, a far cry from its armored juggernaut of the Cold War.

More important, Russia's military budget for 2018 was only \$61 billion, actually down 17 percent from last year. Russia is facing hard economic times. Russia has slipped to fourth place in military spending after the U.S., China, and Saudi Arabia.

The U.S. and its wealthy allies account for two-thirds of world military spending. In fact, the U.S.' total military budget, including for nuclear weapons and foreign wars, is about \$1 trillion, 50 percent of total U.S. Government discretionary spending.

In addition, Russia must defend a vast territory from the Baltic to the Pacific. The U.S. is fortunate in having Mexico and Canada as neighbors. Russia has North Korea, China, India, the Middle East, and NATO to watch.

As with its naval forces, Russia's armies are too far apart to lend one another mutual support. Two vulnerable rail lines are Russia's main land link between European Russia and its Pacific Far East.

Trump's extra supplemental military budget boost this year of \$54 billion is almost as large as Russia's entire 2018 military budget. As for Trump's claim that Europe is not paying its fair share of NATO expenses, note that Britain and France combined together spend more on their military forces than Russia.

In Europe, it is hard to find many people who still consider Russia a serious threat, except for some dippy Danes, right-wing Swedes, and assorted Russophobic East Europeans. The main fear of Russia seems concentrated in the minds of American neoconservatives, media, and victims of the bizarre anti-Russian hysteria that has gripped the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, that is from the Margolis column, and I hope that Members in this Congress will keep those words in mind.

PRO-GROWTH POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I want to talk about our pro-growth policies that are working for the American people.

Throughout this year, I have met with small-business owners, college students, seniors, and folks all across my district to hear how the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has impacted them. Time and again—time and again—I hear the same story: People have more money in their pockets. Their businesses are doing well. Their utility bills are lower. Their small businesses are expanding. Their economic outlook is better than it used to be. And we are headed in the right direction.

Employers are now investing not only in their businesses but, more importantly, in their people. These benefits are not just limited to my district in Georgia. Our economy is booming across this great Nation, and Americans across this country are reaping the benefits of comprehensive tax reform.

Thanks to our pro-growth policies, we are finally seeing true economic recovery, and America is on a path to being the best place in the world to do business once again.

Our work isn't done. We still have work to do. And we will continue to fight for the American worker and American business while we make this the greatest place in the world to do business. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to do just that.

It is mind-boggling to me, when you look around this great Nation and you see the success, that we actually have Members of this body who want to take that success away from this country and want to take money out of the American people's pockets and bring it right back here to Washington, D.C. That is a thought process that I think is wrong, and I don't understand it.

We need to keep fighting for the American family, the American worker, the American business, so that this country continues to be the best place in the world to do business. Tax reform is an example of how we get that done.

RECOGNIZING HUNTER TRUCK SALES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 80th anniversary of a reputable business headquartered in my hometown of Butler, Pennsylvania: Hunter Truck Sales.

Hunter Truck Sales is a family owned and operated, authorized dealer of Peterbilt and International heavy-duty trucks and is one of the largest heavy-duty truck commercial providers in the Northeast.

□ 1045

Hunter Truck is a staple of the community, and their success over the last 80 years confirms that the American Dream is alive and thriving in Pennsylvania and throughout the whole United States.

Hunter Truck Sales is a name that has been synonymous with reliability since its founding in 1938. The business was started by Homer Hunter. Homer opened a small service station in the rural town of Eau Claire, Pennsylvania, and quickly developed a reputation for his unparalleled commitment to trucking solutions with personalized sales, service, and parts.

With hard work and unwavering dedication, the company has continuously grown and was eventually awarded a new truck sales franchise from International Harvester, followed by earning a Peterbilt heavy-duty truck franchise.

Homer, along with his brothers, created a customer-centric business that focused on teamwork, trust, accountability, and integrity. These very values led the company to its many achievements, and they remain at the core of the Hunter Truck Sales today, which is now owned and operated by the third generation of the Hunter family: Jeff Hunter, Dave Hunter, William Hunter, and Nancy Hunter-Mycka.

Hunter Truck currently operates 20 locations in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New York, and New Jersey, and proudly employs nearly 1,000 people. Keep in mind all this started with a small service station and a family with big dreams and great work ethic. It is families like the Hunters who help local economies flourish by establishing successful business practices that can be sustained for multiple generations.

While the services provided have evolved and the scope of the business has expanded, Hunter Truck remains fully committed to both their cus-

tomers and the communities they call home.

As a leader in the heavy-duty truck industry, Hunter truck has invested in its workforce and in unique technologies that align with their mission, which is to build long-term relationships that reflect value, integrity, and teamwork by providing their customers with excellent parts, service, and products.

It is truly an honor to recognize the Hunter family and Hunter Truck Sales for their pioneering spirit in the demonstration of core American values. I encourage them to continue on what they have built with absolute pride—not boastful pride, but pride in knowing what Mr. Hunter started in 1938 has flourished and has provided so many jobs for so many people for so long. It is an incredible tribute to the way Americans think.

Small businesses are the backbone of this country, and Hunter Truck Sales is truly an inspiration to entrepreneurs everywhere.

UPHOLD THE STIMSON DOCTRINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the President of the United States is engaged in a massive campaign of deception that threatens to upend U.S. policy towards Crimea, shake confidence in U.S. global leadership, and override the stated will of the United States Congress.

This dangerous precedent set in Crimea cannot be overstated. Putin's forcible and illegal annexation of Crimea, the first forcible seizure of territory in Europe since World War II, undermines Ukrainian sovereignty and threatens the stability of European borders.

Acquiescence on the part of the United States threatens the security of sovereign nations. Who is next? Moldova? Georgia? The Baltic States?

It is the longstanding policy of the United States not to recognize territorial changes effected by force, as dictated by the Stimson Doctrine established in 1932 by then Republican Secretary of State Henry Stimson.

We upheld that doctrine with the issuance of the Welles Declaration in 1940, which stated emphatically that the United States would not recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by then the Soviet Union. That policy remained in effect for 50 long years.

For more than 50 years, we stood by the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, sometimes in the face of ridicule. Today, they are independent sovereign states and good members of NATO. The collective wisdom of the previous and current administrations, Congress, our European allies, and the American public is that similar principles must be adopted with respect to Crimea.

Crimea was Putin's original violation in the Ukraine, and we have limited credibility objecting to Russia's subsequent invasion of the Luhansk and Donetsk if we do not stand firm with respect to Crimea.

The Obama administration established a nonrecognition policy toward Russian sovereignty over Crimea and levied sanctions against individuals and entities enabling Russia's occupation. Our allies in Europe stood with us shoulder to shoulder in emphasizing and enforcing those sanctions.

Congress codified President Obama's Crimea sanctions and has repeatedly used the power of the purse to prohibit the use of government funds for any action that would recognize the de jure or de facto illegal annexation of Crimea.

And in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, Congress reiterated its support for the Stimson Doctrine and its application to the illegal invasions by Russia and occupations of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, Crimea, and eastern Ukraine, and the Transnistria region of Moldova. Even the State Department for the current administration has reiterated our nonrecognition policy and enforced Crimea sanctions.

But through all of this, one man stands alone atop his bully pulpit with opaque intentions and armed with an arsenal of half-truths and downright lies. That person is the President of the United States, Donald Trump.

I do not particularly care that Donald Trump personally admires Vladimir Putin. Everyone needs a role model. However, President Trump's willful ignorance of the crisis in the Ukraine has had him repeat propaganda and support policies that are so foreign that they would make Mr. Putin very happy.

It was candidate Trump who said both "Crimea has been taken" and Putin is "not going into Ukraine." I will not attempt to untangle the contradictions therein. I trust President Trump has had time to study and understand why his comments betrayed a shockingly tenuous grasp of U.S. foreign policy and our increasingly dangerous geopolitical climate.

As Commander in Chief, the President has since had time to learn more about the situation in the Crimea and eastern Ukraine. Unfortunately, he has learned all the wrong lessons and has adopted a confrontational approach to current U.S. policy regarding Crimea.

In justifying his position, the President has repeated several myths, some of which were no doubt originated by the Kremlin's own propaganda machine.

Myth number one: The people of Crimea have said they preferred Russia—only in a referendum in an occupied Crimea with Russian troops all over the state. No referendum has validity at the end of a barrel of a gun.

Myth number two: The demographics of Crimea demand they be part of Russia because most of them speak Russian. I am sure Russian speaking populations in the Baltic Republics revolt at that kind of notion. And the claim also erases history because Crimean Tatars were forcibly removed from Crimea by the dictator Stalin.

This is the President's most insidious myth, the third one; recognizing Crimea could help improve relations with Russia.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I don't think so. Russia has a much more extensive agenda.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. It is time for the United States to recognize—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

Mr. CONNOLLY. ***.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

ORGANIC AGRICULTURE LISTENING SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on Monday, I hosted and chaired a Listening Session on Organic Agriculture at our State capitol in Harrisburg.

Agriculture is a key economic driver in Pennsylvania and remains the Commonwealth's number one industry. One in seven jobs in Pennsylvania is connected to agriculture, a fact especially important in rural areas, generating some \$7.4 billion in sales in 2017.

Yet agriculture in Pennsylvania and around the country goes well beyond our local communities. Our farmers not only feed, clothe, and provide energy and fiber for all Americans, but also to many other nations around the world.

Pennsylvania agriculture is diverse and encompasses a wide array of commodities and production methods. Monday's listening session was specifically focused on the organic agriculture sector in Pennsylvania.

I was proudly joined by my colleagues, Congressman SCOTT PERRY and Congressman TOM MARINO, as well as Pennsylvania's agriculture deputy secretary, Cheryl Cook. We heard from a number of expert panelists, including: Leslie Zuck of Pennsylvania Certified Organic; Dr. Kristy Borrelli of Penn State extension; Scott Sechler of Bell & Evans; Ken Rice, an organic livestock feed seller; Andrew Kline, an organic beef and milk producer; and Hannah Smith-Brubaker of the Pennsylvania Sustainable Agriculture Association, or PASA.

We heard some tremendous testimony from the all-star panel, and I

thank them for their insights. Over the past decade, organic agriculture has flourished around the Nation. From 2015 to 2016, the number of certified organic farms nationwide increased to more than 14,000, and the number of certified acres increased by 15 percent, according to the USDA.

Pennsylvania has been a leading State in organic agriculture with more than 800 farms across the Commonwealth. With some farms transitioning and others just starting out in agriculture, organic is being supported in a variety of ways. Through Pennsylvania Certified Organic, Penn State's extension activities, stakeholder organizations, and the State Department of Agriculture, many are working to help farmers who wish to transition to organic farming.

There have also been a variety of supports put in place at the Federal level. Title X of the farm bill is the horticulture portion of the law which covers specialty crops, local and regional foods, and organic agriculture.

The 2014 farm bill included \$34 million annually to organic producers. This includes support for USDA's Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, the National Organic Certification Cost Share Program, the National Organic Program, and the Organic Data Initiative. The farm bill also authorizes the Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Program, the Farmers Market and Local Food Promotion Program, the Market Access Program, the EQIP Organic Initiative, and our bedrock agricultural conservation programs.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House and Senate have been working diligently to write the next farm bill as the current law expires in September. Writing a new farm bill is timely, as rural areas have been hit hard by farm recession in recent years with the average farm income roughly half of what it was just 5 years ago.

Since both the House and Senate have passed versions of the farm bill, I look forward to working out the differences in conference. This new law will certainly continue to support both traditional as well as organic agriculture on many fronts, and I look forward to getting the final bill across the finish line.

HONORING WORLD WAR I HEROES IN CLINTON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of two World War I heroes from Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

Private First Class Ira Cranmer Keller and Corporal Beale Marshall Darby are the hometown soldiers for which the county's Keller & Darby Memorial Park is named. Private First Class Keller was 24 years old and the first Clinton County soldier to be killed during World War I. Corporal Darby was only 18 years old and is the second hometown soldier to lose his life in the Great War.

Their families donated land in North Bend to be used as a public park, for-

ever commemorating their sacrifice for our freedom. This Sunday, there will be a formal memorial and rededication ceremony. A World War I Soldiers' Commemorative Monument will also be unveiled in the park.

Mr. Speaker, a century later, we are celebrating the lives of these two soldiers and honoring the sacrifice that they made to this great Nation. To this day, the park honors these North Bend heroes, as their families intended. It is a place where we will always remember the sacrifices that come with our freedom, and we will never forget.

OUR GUARANTEED FOUR FREEDOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, it was in this Chamber in 1941 that Franklin Roosevelt told the world that every man, woman, and child in the world should be guaranteed four freedoms: the freedom of speech, the freedom of worship, the freedom from fear, and the freedom from want.

And Mr. Speaker, today, our President has taken a wrecking ball to all four of those guarantees. He has declared that the press is the enemy of the American people—going after that treasured freedom of speech, the right for me to speak here in this well, for people to assemble outside, and for the journalists behind me in the gallery to report on it—the freedom of worship that every man and woman and child could pray to the God of their choosing and not be discriminated because of it. Our country, as we speak right now today, has a Muslim ban in place.

□ 1100

Freedom from fear: Nearly daily, the President tweets out that the immigrants fleeing the harshest places in the world from violence and abject poverty are the problem, that they are murderers and rapists.

And freedom from want: The idea that if you work hard, it will mean something. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber passed, and the President signed, a tax cut where 83 percent of the benefits went to the wealthiest among us. Not a tax cut that told our businesses: You can be more competitive, but you have to share the profits with those who generated your productivity.

Those four freedoms that we have all relied upon and depend upon in our country are being knocked down. We have an opportunity in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to unite and work together to restore those freedoms and rebuild them.

Our Founders, in their wisdom, envisioned that you could have a wrecking-ball, out-of-control Presidency, and they did not leave us helpless. They envisioned that the Article I check and balance of a Congress, elected by the

people, could be a check on the President.

As our President right now is abroad, insulting our allies, drawing us closer to adversaries like Russia, we can be a check. We can say, when it comes to those families separated at the border, we are not going to put a single priority of the President forward until he reunites all of them. When it comes to the press, who are under attack in speech that is constantly being suppressed, we can pass the Journalist Protection Act, which I recently introduced, which would make it a Federal crime to commit violence against anyone in the news gathering business. There is a lot we can do together.

And as it comes to our democracy, Mr. Speaker, we are just 4 months away from an election. The adversary that our President is meeting with is determined to interfere again. The best antidote to stop that would be for us to unite and pass legislation to have an independent commission. That is bipartisan legislation that is out there.

We can be the check that our Founders envisioned. We can be the check that our constituents really need us to be during these trying times.

We are not helpless, Mr. Speaker. We can pick up the pieces, and we can rebuild and restore those freedoms that FDR stood in this Chamber and guaranteed to the world that we would have. That should still be true today in America.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend John Hill, Flint Hill United Methodist Church, Alexander City, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Gracious, mighty, and wonderful God, I pray for this historic Chamber, and I most humbly ask for Your wisdom, discernment, and grace to be showered upon these representatives of the people.

Allow their decisions to be made with selfless interest, keeping a keen eye upon the good of our Nation as a whole. Let their collegiality and respect for one another be an example of statesmanship to our Nation. Give them the humbleness to bring differing opinions and work together toward the best solution.

Allow them to disagree without vilifying, and may their differences be

brought together for the good of the country so that the United States of America may be a shining beacon of hope and liberty to the world. May they be reminded of the sacred trust the people have placed in them and not shrink from this awesome responsibility that they have accepted.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THOSE KILLED OR WOUNDED IN SERVICE TO OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in honor of those who have been killed or wounded in service to our country and all those who serve and their families.

WELCOMING REVEREND JOHN HILL

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our guest chaplain, Reverend John Hill. Reverend Hill lives in Alexander City, Alabama, and is the pastor of Flint Hill United Methodist Church.

In 2010, Reverend Hill had his ordination as elder in the United Methodist Church; and in 2017, he achieved senior chaplain status with the International Conference of Police Chaplains, certification in critical incident stress management, and became a certified instructor for group crisis intervention.

Reverend Hill has done chaplain work with several police departments across the State as well as with the Alabama Department of Public Safety. He also was selected to serve as a volunteer chaplain for the United States Secret Service.

Reverend Hill is joined today by his wife, Jill, and their three children, and it is my honor to welcome him to the House of Representatives and our Nation's Capitol.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

WELCOMING PENN STATE 4-H TO THE CAPITOL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome members of the Penn State 4-H program to the Nation's Capitol. This afternoon, students will share their 4-H experiences with me and discuss the importance the program has had in their lives.

4-H is open to all young people regardless of where they live, what their backgrounds are, or what interests them. From traditional activities for youth in rural places to after-school programs for city youth, 4-H has it all.

Last month, Penn State 4-H hosted the first Pennsylvania 4-H Science of Agriculture Challenge in State College. Scores of 4-H teams competed in the challenge that was based around the American Farm Bureau's Pillars of Agricultural Literacy.

First place went to the Westmoreland County equestrian team. The marketing team from Clarion County came in second. Third place went to the Armstrong County Idea Makers. Teams from Allegheny County and Washington County rounded out the top five winners.

Mr. Speaker, 4-H plays an incredible role in the lives of American students who are learning leadership, citizenship, and life skills. I am proud that 4-H helps so many reach their full potential.

ACA SABOTAGE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, another week, another two blatant attempts by this administration to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

On Saturday, the Trump administration announced it is ending payments that help insurers meet the requirement to cover individuals with pre-existing conditions. These risk adjustment payments pool risk for insurers so all Americans can be covered, not just the healthiest few.

Just yesterday, the Trump administration announced it is slashing funds for healthcare navigators by 70 percent. These navigators are the individuals trained to help Americans compare and enroll in plans. Without navigator assistance, more Americans will struggle to enroll, and more people will go uninsured.

These changes and other actions previously announced by this administration will result in higher premiums for millions of individuals and small businesses.

Remember this: the 130 million Americans, those of us with preexisting conditions, will pay the heaviest price.

This cynical effort to diminish access to quality, affordable care has to stop. The Trump administration needs to abandon its effort to undermine the ACA and instead start working with those of us who want to improve, rather than tear down, our healthcare system.

CONGRATULATING MIAMI BRIDGE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Miami Bridge on its 33rd anniversary. Located in my congressional district, Miami Bridge works to provide a safe haven for teens who are abandoned, neglected, and homeless in Miami-Dade County.

Miami Bridge is the only emergency home in south Florida which shelters children from ages 10 to 17. This organization provides and promotes positive youth development programs and strengthens families to enable children and teens to become productive members of our community.

Annually, Miami Bridge houses more than 600 children and teens and provides counseling to more than 550 families. From assisting families in developing the necessary skills to comfort at-risk children to empowering youngsters with opportunities to make positive life choices, Miami Bridge's many services help children overcome the challenges that confront them and realize their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to represent Miami Bridge, and I congratulate its wonderful staff, its board members, and its volunteers for their tremendous efforts to save at-risk youth from a life of victimization and homelessness.

RHODE ISLAND'S FISHERIES

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, Rhode Island's commercial fishing industry provides thousands of good-paying jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars of economic activity every year; but later today, the House is voting on a bill that will jeopardize this critical sector of our State's economy. H.R. 200 undermines the science-based catch limits that we have used in recent decades to keep fisheries sustainable for the long term.

We have seen this movie before. It was just a few decades ago that Congress first put the science-based catch

limits in place. Congress had to do so because overfishing had brought America's fisheries to the brink of economic and environmental collapse.

It turns out the science works. Since Congress put these science-based catch limits in place, dozens of fish stocks have been brought back to sustainable levels and overfishing incidents have been cut substantially. Good-paying jobs in the fishing industry have thrived. The industry now, as a whole, generates billions of dollars in economic activity every year.

H.R. 200 will reverse this progress. We cannot let it pass. It is a terrible bill that will harm fishermen in my State and all up and down the coast.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reject this bill.

THE COLORBLIND BOOM IN JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, Investor's Business Daily published an editorial titled: "Colorblind Boom in Jobs."

The editorial begins: "It may be a surprise, but President Trump is nowhere near as unpopular among minority voters as the biased mainstream media suggest. Why is that? In a word, jobs.

"Trump, it turns out, has been the most consequential President in history when it comes to minority employment. In June, for instance, the unemployment rate for Hispanics and Latinos 16 years and older fell to 4.6 percent, its lowest level ever. . . ."

African American unemployment of 6.5 percent "represents the second lowest unemployment reading ever for Black Americans.

"As for Asian Americans, unemployment similarly bounced off its all-time low. . . ."

"The truth is, the ripping jobs growth that began when Trump entered office and picked up steam after his tax cuts has been good for everyone in America—even liberal media pundits."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Best wishes, Judge Brett Kavanaugh, with an impeccable record of service to be on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Happy birthday, Jackson Gossett.

PENSIONS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have worked hard their entire lives paying into pension programs with the promise that, after a career of hard labor, they would have a secure transition into retirement.

Our multiemployer pension plans, of which there are 114, covering 1.3 million workers, are severely underfunded and in trouble. The Butch Lewis Act is an important step in responsibly securing the pensions that millions of American workers have earned throughout their years of hard work.

We must ensure that the pensions that American union workers have earned over a lifetime of work are protected well into the future. This Congress needs to take action now to ensure the promise of those who were promised after years of contributions to have a pension in their retirement years.

178 WORDS OF FORGOTTEN HISTORY THAT MUST BE TOLD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on November 11, 1918, the war to end all wars came to an end.

Over 4 million American doughboys went off to fight on the battlefields and in the brutal trenches of Europe. Mr. Speaker, 116,000 of America's sons and daughters were killed in combat, and 200,000 more were wounded.

All the survivors of the great World War I have since died. They are no more. We must never forget their selfless sacrifices to make this world a freer place.

Last year, our country finally broke ground in Washington, D.C., on a memorial to honor their service to our country. I am privileged that Representative CLEAVER and I helped make this memorial a reality. Forever their sacrifice for this Nation and this world will be preserved in bronze and stone in the heart of this city.

May our country never forget their sacred pledge, recited in George Cohan's song:

We'll be over,
We're coming over,
And we won't come back,
Till it's over, over there.

And that is just the way it is.

SAN DIEGO PRIDE

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Pride Month in San Diego and honor our progress.

In 1974, a group of LGBTQ San Diegans were denied a permit to host a pride parade. Despite facing great danger, dozens bravely marched in the streets. So this weekend, over 200,000 San Diegans are expected to join together to celebrate how far we have come and spread the message of equality.

Though we have made great progress, this month also marks the 1-year anniversary of a lawsuit that was actually

filed against me for displaying a pride flag in front of my office. This frivolous lawsuit is a great reminder of why Pride Month is still necessary and why our work is never done.

The pride flag symbolizes the ideals of liberty, equality, and love that this month celebrates. No lawsuit will deter me from defending these values.

I am proud to be an ally in this fight and will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with our LGBTQ community.

Happy pride, San Diego.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF HERB APPEL

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, the heart and soul of Fort Bend County in my hometown of Sugar Land is in great pain today. Herb Appel put on his angel wings and joined our Lord yesterday. We are the most diverse county in America, and the best place to start a family, raise a family, and start a business because of Herb Appel.

Herb was a long-time CEO of the Fort Bend Economic Development Corporation. During his tenure, Schlumberger moved their North American headquarters to Sugar Land, Smart Financial Center opened, and Texas Instruments stayed in Fort Bend County, moving from Stafford to Sugar Land. The list goes on and on and on.

Herb was called home on a cruise he took with his wife, Emelia, and most of his five kids, sixteen grandkids, and two great grandkids. He was at sea with a sea of love around him.

When Herb met God yesterday, God said: Well done, good and faithful servant. God bless Herb Appel.

A BETTER LIFE

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, our so-called Commander in Chief is over in Europe where he criticized some of our closest allies as being delinquent. What is wrong with him? Hypocrisy is clearly not a constraint to behavior.

TrumpCare, the Republican healthcare plan that would strip away protections for preexisting conditions and will cause premiums, copays, and deductibles to go up, is delinquent. The Republican tax scam, where 83 percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest 1 percent in America to subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless is delinquent. The fake Republican infrastructure plan that will do nothing to fix our Nation's crumbling bridges, roads, and tunnels is delinquent.

Republicans have a raw deal. Democrats have A Better Deal. We are going to do everything possible to make life better for the people.

AMERICANS BELIEVE NEWS IS BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Gallup recently polled Americans on their perceptions of bias, inaccuracy, and misinformation in news reporting. Their survey found:

Sixty-two percent said the news they read in newspapers, see on television, or hear on the radio is biased;

Forty-four percent believe the news they read in newspapers, see on television, or hear on the radio is inaccurate;

More than a third described the news they see on these channels as misinformation—false or inaccurate information that is presented as if it were true. In other words, fake news.

The same poll found 8 out of 10 adults feel angry or bothered by seeing biased information.

It is obvious that the news media have abandoned objective, fact-based reporting and are instead promoting a liberal agenda. Their news reports only tell one side of the story: their side. Until the news media returns to objective reporting, Americans will continue to view them skeptically.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERICK SILVA

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to remember the life of Erick Silva.

Erick was a security guard at the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1. As soon as gunshots went off, he immediately began selflessly helping people and was, unfortunately, shot in the process.

Erick's life goal was to help others by becoming a police officer. He would buy burgers for homeless people, treat relatives to dinner, and help his mom pay her bills by working long shifts and holding yard sales in his free time.

Erick was humble, pure, and real. He was known for being funny and always cracking jokes. He would go above and beyond what was asked of him and would put others first. He is remembered as being the epitome of integrity, service, and excellence.

I would like to extend my condolences to Erick Silva's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID FREYLING

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember David Freyling, a dear friend and dedicated patriot who passed away over the weekend.

Dave's entire life was about serving others. He served in the Army from 1956 to 1966 with the 82nd Airborne in Berlin during the construction of the Berlin Wall, and was later stationed in Korea, where he helped build roads, bridges, and other infrastructure.

Dave dedicated his life to fellow veterans. He was the chairman of the Help for Heroes fund and the Veterans Assistance Commission of Macon County for 13 years, and many knew him for his selflessness in getting veterans the help they need. For many years, he voluntarily drove veterans to the Danville VA hospital nearly 90 miles away, taking 389 total trips and racking up over 70,000 miles, to shuttle his fellow veterans to the VA to get the healthcare they deserved.

He was active in his church, volunteered with the American Red Cross, and was a prominent member of both the American Legion and the Macon County Honor Guard. He served on the Decatur Civic Center Board and worked tirelessly to bring to life the World War II Memorial in town, which was finally completed in 2012, thanks to Dave's hard work. By all accounts, Dave was a true example of patriotism and service.

Words cannot express how much he will be missed. He made an immeasurable impact on the lives of veterans and the entire Decatur community. I extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Jeannine, and to all those who knew Dave. I am so glad he got to watch the fireworks before he passed.

CLEMENCY FOR HAMMONDS

(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 thank President Trump for his willingness to resolve a major injustice. I am speaking, of course, about the news that the President has decided to pardon Oregon ranchers Dwight Hammond and his son, Steven Hammond.

They have already served jail sentences for a controlled burn on their land, which was adjacent to Federal lands that were already out of control with a fire. They used the fire tool to try and keep their own land from being overcome by poorly managed Federal lands and the fires that frequently occur upon them.

They served a sentence for that already. Yet overzealous prosecutors, using terrorism legislation in the law, came back after them again and forced them to serve even more time, unfairly. It was the type of law that was used in the case of the Oklahoma City bombing. Approximately 139 acres of Federal land was burned accidentally to try and stop fire.

The Hammonds aren't from my district. They are from Mr. WALDEN's district in Oregon, and I commend him for his work to help make sure this clemency has happened for these people. They are good citizens who are well-known in Oregon. They have relatives and many friends in my northern California district as well.

Their case is a prime example of the previous administration's overbearing regulation and enforcement on the users of public land, while, at the same time, their poor stewardship has caused these dangerous conditions.

It is too bad they will never get the time back that they served. But I am, indeed, glad for President Trump granting clemency to the Hammond family.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 5515.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 11:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 41.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 985 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 985

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 985, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, and also H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, equally divided by the chair and ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, respectively. It also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill.

Last night, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from the sponsor of H.R. 3281, Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado, about his bill and its importance for improving the management of water and water-related facilities. We also heard from my friend and a former Rules Committee member, Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX, on H.R. 50, which she introduced.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are, at their core, about promoting effective government and enhancing the cooperation and collaboration between the government and non-Federal entities.

The Federal Government has its hands in a lot of things. That is not always a bad thing, but we see far too many instances where Federal involvement does more harm than good. That is why Republicans in this Chamber are committed to reining in the Federal Government where it needs to be reined in, to increasing its efficiency and transparency, and to giving the American people a louder voice in the decisions that impact them.

H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, empowers water users and seeks to reduce the administrative paperwork and liability Federal taxpayers bear by streamlining the process through which some Bureau of Reclamation projects are transferred to non-Federal entities.

Today, the Bureau of Reclamation is the Nation's largest wholesale water supplier, providing one out of five Western farmers with irrigation water and delivering trillions of gallons to people annually.

Under the current law, the BOR is allowed to transfer day-to-day operational and maintenance responsibilities to project beneficiaries, but the Bureau cannot transfer title or ownership of any of these facilities unless

Congress specifically enacts legislation authorizing such a transfer.

This legislation recognizes that Federal bureaucracy is not doing any favors for water users or for aging infrastructure projects. That is why this bill focuses on empowering local water users and incentivizing non-Federal investment in water infrastructure. This bill helps reduce regulatory paperwork and the Federal backlog on water infrastructure repair, while increasing efficiencies for water users.

Where Congress can streamline Federal operations and increase local control to the benefit of taxpayers and end users, we should act. H.R. 3281 is a step toward accomplishing both of these goals on Bureau of Reclamation projects.

On the next bill, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. As I mentioned earlier, this bill continues the trend of empowering State and local governments and lightening the grip of the Federal Government.

In 1995, Congress acted through the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act to prevent the imposition of burdensome and costly Federal unfunded mandates on State and local governments. That was a worthy goal 23 years ago and remains so today.

As a former appropriator at the State level in the State of Georgia, I understand, many times, what good-intentioned work from up here can do, actually, on impacts to State budgets and local budgets, and this is a worthy goal for us to take up.

It has become clear, however, unfunded mandates are slipping through the cracks or, perhaps more accurately, flooding through gaping holes in the system. In fact, according to an Office of Management and Budget report, unfunded mandates and Federal regulations cost States, cities, and the public between \$44 billion and \$62 billion annually. Even in a town used to throwing around big numbers, that is a big number.

Mr. Speaker, I know the communities in my home of northeast Georgia often struggle to make ends meet. Local governments are rarely flush with cash, and they have to make tough decisions about what priorities receive funding, and in what amounts, in order to best serve their communities. Unfunded mandates, particularly the unexpected ones, can significantly hamper those efforts.

In fact, in recognition of this problem and in pursuit of a solution, those who are most affected by the issue of unfunded mandates—State and local governments—overwhelmingly support this legislation.

The so-called Big 7 organizations representing the State and local governments and officials—the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of

State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the International City/County Management Association—sent a letter earlier this year urging enactment of H.R. 50.

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act represents the type of action Congress is supposed to take. It identifies a problem, it acknowledges the need for policy updates, and it incorporates stakeholder feedback in order to solve that problem.

The bill provided for by this rule closes loopholes in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and applies the requirements of that law to independent agencies. The bill provides for expanded input from State, local, and Tribal governments, as well as from the private sector, by requiring agencies to consult with the government and with the private sector when they are developing significant regulatory mandates.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this update to the law cannot be overstated. I believe that the men and women eking out a living or building a business on the ground know what problems exist and how to remedy them better than the people who are currently residing in cubicles in Washington, D.C.

When bureaucrats are writing regulations that impact northeast Georgians, they need to consult with and glean insight from northeast Georgians. They also need to understand that what works for northeast Georgia might not work for southeast Georgia, Alabama, Nevada, Maine, Ohio, or anywhere else besides where they are.

If the Federal Government is going to implement regulations that impact private entities—which they do far too often, with far too little benefit, in my opinion—those entities need to have and deserve a voice in the process.

H.R. 50 helps give the private sector that agency. It also requires rules that aren't preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking to undergo a UMR analysis if the effects on State, local, and private sectors total \$100 million or more. The bill codifies longstanding regulatory principles regarding cost-benefit analysis and when to regulate, and supports more accurate economic analysis.

Mr. Speaker, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act was designed to promote informed decisionmaking throughout the legislative and regulatory process, in consultation with the entities affected by those processes. Those goals are just as important, if not more important, today as when the UMR was originally signed into law in 1995.

Congress needs to take responsibility to help reduce the burdens regulatory agencies have placed on State and local governments, as well as private entities. Without question, Congress must work to close these loopholes and reduce bureaucracy.

These are the simple concepts, Mr. Speaker: Unnecessary, burdensome

Federal regulations should be identified and reconsidered, and the people and businesses impacted by regulations should have a voice in the regulatory process.

I believe government can operate more efficiently and effectively when we give local stakeholders a voice, when we seek to increase efficiency and remove unwieldy mandates, and when we work to reduce the Federal bureaucracy.

The bill provided for by this rule takes steps in doing just that. I believe that they are steps that we in the House should support to help American communities, citizens, and consumers.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule makes in order two bills and four amendments: H.R. 50, Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2017; and H.R. 3281, Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

H.R. 50 amends the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This is a bill that Congress already voted on in 2015 in nearly a party-line vote in the House before dying in the Senate.

I understand my colleagues think that this is a very important issue. As a former mayor and council member, I know how difficult Federal regulations can be to implement. This legislation, however, does nothing except grind progress to a standstill, blocking improvements to our Nation's health, safety, and environmental protections.

Perhaps that is why this rule also makes in order H.R. 3281, which assaults our Nation's environmental and health standards in a different way. This legislation, which I opposed in the Natural Resources Committee, would authorize a de facto privatization of Federal infrastructure across the Western U.S., all while stiffing our taxpayers.

The bill does not require that taxpayers be compensated for the loss of publicly owned land and mineral interests. Imagine, once again, this Congress is putting the interests of private business ahead of our hardworking taxpayers.

This legislation is a proposal from President Trump's infrastructure plan, which largely seeks to enrich developers and private businesses at the expense of our hardworking taxpayers and the general public as a whole.

I could understand spending time on these bills if we had finished the pressing work before us, but with thousands—and I mean thousands—of children still separated from their parents due to the cruel actions of this administration, is this really what we are spending time on? Where are the moral priorities and family values of this Congress?

I have spoken with the Department of Homeland Security, and I have spoken with the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, and there has been one constant answer from both of them: They have absolutely no idea what they are doing, no idea where the parents of these children are, no idea how many children have been put into foster care, no idea when these families will be reunited, and no idea what comes next.

Congress has a responsibility to act, not next week, not next month, not next year, but today. Once we leave for August recess, let me remind you, it will be 39 days before we come back. That means 39 more days that we are going to allow children to be held in detention, in cages, in cold cells, without their parents.

The Trump administration has already missed the first deadline to reunite families. What assurances do we have that they won't miss the second deadline, or the third one, or possibly the fourth one? How many more deadlines does this Congress, this administration, need before we realize that we are complicit—complicit—in separating children from their parents who care about them?

And while we have them in our custody, we are complicit in not properly taking care of them. "Full of dirt and lice," that is how an immigrant mother described her 14-month-old baby son who had been returned to her after 85 days of separation.

We must act because this administration chooses not to. Failure to do so will mean more families are broken forever, more families like Yasmin's.

On May 22, Yasmin and her two teenage daughters entered the United States and were immediately apprehended and then separated. The mother was transferred to the McAllen holding center—also known as the dog pound, as they call it—with a group of other separated mothers.

After 7 days, the mothers were told that they would be deported without their children. Many of the mothers fainted when they heard this news. One mother had a seizure in a cell. After appearing in court, Yasmin was handcuffed, shackled, and given no information on the status of her children. Family values.

After being transferred to another detention center, Yasmin was informed that her daughters had been reunited with their father. But Yasmin still remains in a detention center, where she has gone more than a month separated from her children. She has received absolutely no information about when she will see her children again and must simply wait and pray. Family values.

These people are fleeing for their lives to the promise and safety of the United States, and we aren't even considering their asylum cases.

Let me tell you another story, Mr. Speaker. A woman from El Salvador decided to flee to the U.S. with her two

young boys, ages 4 and 10, after receiving grave threats from MS-13 gang members. Prior to fleeing to the U.S., she had sought protection from Salvadoran authorities through the legal process but had not received any protection.

In March of this year, she presented herself to the border officials, after making a conscious decision not to enter the U.S. at an official port of entry. She had learned that CBP officials are turning away asylum seekers in direct—direct—violation of the United States and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The mother and her two boys were apprehended and taken to a Border Patrol processing station. The mother was sent to an adult detention center in Laredo, and the boys were sent to a shelter for unaccompanied children under the Office of Refugee Resettlement within Health and Human Services.

At one point, the brothers were separated from one another and placed into two separate foster homes, but were eventually reunited and released to family on the East Coast.

Under current law and procedure—something this Congress could change today—the children have absolutely no right to an appointed lawyer. Without their mother to speak on their behalf, the 4-year-old and the 10-year-old boys must make a case for asylum on their own in separate court cases.

□ 1245

This is what we could be doing today: One, fixing the broken laws that have toddlers, toddlers who are barely out of diapers, representing themselves in court and fixing the root causes of these issues with the Central American Family Protection and Reunification Act, legislation I have offered with Ranking Member ENGEL.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule so that we can use our limited time here to act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.J. Res. 31, sponsored by Representatives DEUTCH and MCGOVERN and RASKIN, which would reserve Supreme Court decisions like Citizens United by enshrining in the Constitution of the United States a democracy for all amendments, establishing the right of the American people to enact State and Federal laws that regulate spending in public elections.

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 California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) to discuss this proposal.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and, Mr. Speaker, this proposed constitutional amendment will overturn Citizens United and will put voters back in charge of Washington.

Over 90 percent of American voters want background checks on gun sales; three-quarters want aggressive action on climate change; 85 percent want guaranteed paid sick leave; and 75 percent of the people in our country think we ought to raise the minimum wage.

The problem is these are the priorities of voters instead of the priorities of donors, and right now, in this House, donors call the shots. Ninety-three percent of Americans believe that we don't hear their voices. The cynicism is deep and it is bipartisan.

Only 5 percent of Republicans and 6 percent of Democrats believe that their views are heard by their elected Representatives. Why? The Supreme Court's disastrous Citizens United decision held that unlimited election spending doesn't corrupt our political system.

The Citizens United decision was wrong. To American voters, our Congress and our government institutions look like they are bought and paid for.

In recent elections, just 150 wealthy families and the corporations that they control have flooded our elections with hundreds of millions of dollars. That money buys something. Unlimited money in our elections too often determines who can afford to run and sets the legislative agenda here in Washington.

Here is what needs to be asked: If your family can't answer a politician's phone call when they ask for a donation, if they can't afford billboards and television ad buys, how are their voices being heard?

It doesn't matter whether a wealthy donor supports policies on the left or right. Each side has its billionaires. Let's be clear about that. But none of them should be able to spend unlimited resources in our election.

Unlimited spending doesn't produce more speech. It produces louder speech. It compromises the free speech rights of everyone else in America. It corrupts elections when people are sent to Washington to work on behalf of corporate interests rather than voters' interests. And it leaves our elections vulnerable to attacks from foreign adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get big money out of politics; it is time to get secret, dark money out of our elections; and it is time to get foreign money out of our campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, for the sake of our democracy, it is time to overturn Citizens United and put voters back in charge of Washington.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who has been a leader

on this issue of money and politics for years.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues to urge Members to vote “no” on the previous question so we can bring to the floor the Deutch-McGovern-Raskin bill and so we can at long last have a debate on campaign finance.

The fact of the matter is there is too much money in our politics. The fact of the matter is that this money has a corrupting influence on our politics.

Look at the bills that come before this House of Representatives. It is not about empowering people. It is always about a giveaway to a big corporation, changing the rules on who can sit on scientific advisory boards to include corporate cronies.

The tax bill that my Republican friends brought to the House floor that they voted on and that they take such pride in, basically 85 percent of those benefits went to the top 1 percent income earners in this country.

The bottom line is this place is becoming a place where money can buy anything. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this House of Representatives. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this White House, and people are sick of it.

When I talk to audiences back home—they could be liberal audiences or conservative audiences—the two issues that I mention where everybody nods approvingly are when I say that there is too much money in politics, everybody says “yes.” And then when I say that Congress is dysfunctional, they all nod their heads approvingly.

Enough. We need to change this system. People all across the country, an overwhelming majority, want us to change the way we do our politics. They believe that they should have the power, not corporate special interests, not people who are the wealthiest in this country.

Let’s give the people of this country what they want. Let’s have their voices matter more than the special interest groups.

We have tried time and time and time again to bring these issues to the floor, and we are constantly rebuked. Look, we shouldn’t be surprised, because this is now the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America: more amendments routinely get denied in the Rules Committee; more bills have come to the floor under a completely closed process.

We debate bills, again, that benefit the well-off and the well-connected. We ought to debate some bills that help regular people. And having a real debate on campaign finance reform, having a real debate on how we get big money out of our politics is an issue we should be dealing with right now. It is what the American people want.

Let’s do, for once, what the American people want; let’s do what our con-

stituents want; and, Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by saying we can have that debate by voting “no” on the previous question.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that to my colleagues, especially those on the Republican side.

If you vote “no” on the previous question, we can have this debate. We can have a debate about how we get big money out of politics. We can have a debate about how we drain the swamp, how we clean this place up.

You can go around and say you want to drain the swamp. That is just rhetoric, because what you are really doing is you are helping the well-off and the well-connected.

The people who give the most money, they get their legislation to the floor. Regular people routinely get their interests blocked in this Chamber. It is time to clean up this place.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) to speak on the continuing horror stories about what has happened at our Nation’s border.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of a young mother. Her name is Rosa. Just like my mom, she came to America in search of a better life.

Rosa’s home was in Trujillo, Honduras, where she lived with her aging parents and her son, Juan. Violent gangs controlled the town, and Rosa feared her young son would be targeted like so many others in her neighborhood.

Under these desperate circumstances, Rosa did what any loving mother would do. She took her modest life savings and her son and fled north in search of safety. When they finally made it to the U.S. border near Yuma, Arizona, Rosa and Juan were met by American authorities who asked her an ominous question: Don’t you know we’re separating children from their families here? She told them no, but it was too late. Rosa and Juan are still separated.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is now reuniting a small number of these families due, in part, to Donald Trump’s orders. But let’s be clear. This isn’t happening out of concern for their welfare. As usual, Donald Trump is only doing the right thing because a court is making him do it.

Trump still wants to set up tent camps in our military bases. He still wants to eviscerate legal protections for migrant children, and he still wants to lock up families. Donald Trump’s goal is to present mothers and children fleeing unspeakable violence with an impossible choice: immediate deportation or indefinite detention. That is appalling.

On the other hand, the Members of this body have an easy choice: make excuses for Trump, or take a stand against the state-sponsored mistreatment of children. It is not a tough decision. We know what we need to do.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many of us in Congress and the Nation are working hard to reunite children with their parents. Family reunification should be a time of joy, but, sadly, that is not always the case.

One mother waited for 4 months to wrap her arms around her little boy. Another mother waited 3 months. These should be moments of joy, yet, when the children did not recognize their parents, this became a troubling situation.

As a father of four, I know what it is to be loved by your children. As a father of four, I know what that parent-child relationship is like. To have children that fail to recognize you after a number of months because you haven’t seen them, well, that is just not right.

The separation of immigrants from their children is just unconstitutional, un-American, and simply wrong, and I demand that all families be united immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

One final story to remind all of us what is at stake here.

Earlier this year, a Honduran father was separated from his wife and child just days after President Trump’s zero-tolerance policies went into effect. Marco Antonio Munoz crossed the Rio Grande with his wife and 3-year-old son on May 12 near the tiny town of Granjeno, Texas. Soon after Marco and his family were taken into custody, they arrived at a processing station in nearby McAllen and said they wanted to apply for asylum.

Border Patrol agents told the family that they would be separated. That is when Border Patrol officials literally ripped Marco’s child from his arms. At no point did Marco attempt to attack or assault the Border Patrol staff, but due to his anguish, he was placed into a padded isolation cell.

Marco began to pray, pray for his family and pray for their safety. Hours passed, and the next morning, after receiving no information about where his family was or when he would see them next, Marco took his life.

Family values.

This is the law and order President Trump has no respect for either. He is disrespecting the rule of law and violating court orders by detaining children, babies, and he is creating

hysteria among families and confusion among Border Patrol and HHS officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule because we can do better than this. We have family values that we must stand for, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

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

□ 1300

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by paraphrasing a comment that the Honorable Chairwoman FOXX made yesterday evening in the Rules Committee.

By the way, I want to bring it back: There is a lot of discussion that we are going to have, but, actually, the rule is about two bills that my friends didn't discuss at all. I hope they vote yes on that, so we can move legislation that has helped move the bureaucracy out of the way, so that things can actually, with common sense, get done. We don't choose to talk about that.

We have a lot of issues. I am in agreement on a lot of things that we need to do. We need to fix our immigration system. But today, let's remind ourselves on the floor what we are doing. It is a rule to deal with two specific bills dealing with regulatory issues.

Ms. FOXX said this yesterday in far more eloquent words than I am offering right now, that those opposed to the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act are those who support unbridled regulations.

I do not support unbridled regulations. I think there are some good regulations, and I think there are some regulations that are necessary. Far too often, we see the Federal Government flooding our community with regulations that do little to achieve their intended benefits, yet come with massive bills, and Washington expects the American people to foot the bill.

Maybe my friends across the aisle enjoy that. Maybe my friends across the aisle want that to continue to happen. Maybe my friends across the aisle who want to vote no on this want to continue to see this happen. We don't. We believe that there is a better way.

The bills provided for by this rule recognize the role of the Federal Government, but they take needed steps to magnify the voices of those closest to the issues.

I support this rule, and I support the underlying bills. I encourage all to do so and look at it honestly from the perspective of those who pay our bills, the people who pay the bills for this government, the ones who go to work every day, who pay their taxes, who want their government to do what the government is supposed to do and stay out of the areas where they are not supposed to be.

This is what this is about, Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, bringing it back

to the truth of the rule that we are debating, and that is what I believe is important.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 985 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

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

SEC. 3. 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 joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution 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 joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 joint resolution, 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 joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 31.

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. Fitz-

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). 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.

Mrs. TORRES. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 200, STRENGTHENING
FISHING COMMUNITIES AND IN-
CREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES
MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 965 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 965

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 965 provides for consideration of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

This structured rule makes in order 11 amendments, including 4 minority and 2 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in coastal Alabama, so I have spent my

entire life experiencing the long-held tradition of fishing off the Gulf Coast. Some of my best memories growing up were fishing with my family, and I have carried on that same tradition with my children. I look forward to fishing with my grandchildren once they get a little older.

This isn't a tradition unique to the Gulf Coast. All along America's shores, countless families and friends have made so many memories while fishing.

No one wants to be a better steward of our Nation's fisheries than those of us who actually enjoy fishing. No one wants a healthier fish stock than those of us who have spent our lives on the water.

That is where H.R. 200 comes in. This bill includes commonsense reforms to ensure that our Nation's fisheries remain strong, while also being accessible to fishermen from every walk of life.

Now, I know this bill is about much more than just those of us who like to fish recreationally. Commercial fishing is a major economic engine in many of our coastal communities, so the bill also ensures access to our oceans and ocean resources for our commercial fishermen.

Just consider these numbers that demonstrate the overall impact of fishing on the U.S. economy:

In 2015, the fishing industry generated \$208 billion in sales and supported 1.62 million American jobs.

Approximately 11 million saltwater anglers spent a total of \$60.9 million on fishing trips, which generated roughly \$22.7 billion in income.

And I want to make one other point. The underlying bill will also ensure that all Americans have access to fresh, sustainable seafood. That is important to our Nation's restaurants, but it is also especially important to seafood lovers like me.

If you doubt the importance of the fishing sector, let me tell you about red snapper fishing in my home State of Alabama. It is a major economic driver for our coastal communities. From restaurants, to gas stations, to bait and tackle shops, to the charter boat industry, red snapper fishing is critically important to the economy in our coastal communities and surrounding areas.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government has failed for years to adequately count the number of red snapper in the Gulf. This has resulted in ridiculously short red snapper seasons, which hurt our fishermen and the economies in our coastal communities.

So, how bad was the Federal Government in counting red snapper? Well, they weren't even sampling for red snapper on reefs, despite the fact that red snapper are reef fish. It made absolutely no sense.

Colleges and universities, like the University of South Alabama, have been able to do a much better job of assessing the health of the red snapper stock with far fewer resources. Their

data has proven to be much more accurate and up to date.

Thankfully, along with my Gulf Coast colleagues, we have been able to work with the Trump administration and the Commerce Department to ensure adequate recreational red snapper seasons over the last 2 years. But this bill includes reforms I authored to help fix the mismanagement of red snapper for all sectors, once and for all. That means allowing for greater State control, especially as it relates to stock assessments and data collection.

That is one of the best things about H.R. 200. The bill eliminates unscientific timeframes to rebuild fish stocks that unnecessarily restrict access to fisheries. Our national fishery policy should be based on sound, accurate data.

The bill goes against the Washington-knows-best approach that has failed so many times in the past. By providing greater flexibility to fishery managers, we can allow for better management strategies that reflect regional needs and demands. We should empower people who live and work in the local communities, instead of letting bureaucrats in Washington decide what works best.

As I mentioned earlier, the bill will allow more Americans to have access to fresh, sustainable seafood. Currently, around 90 percent of seafood consumed in the United States is imported. This is especially troubling when you consider that we have an abundance of fish right here in our own waters. With reforms included in this bill, we can boost access to affordable domestic fish.

Mr. Speaker, by passing H.R. 200, the House can support our Nation's fishermen, American consumers, our coastal communities, and the overall American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 965 and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. It should be better called the empty oceans act.

H.R. 200 really risks rolling back science-based conservation efforts, destroying jobs, and hurting our fisheries and fish stocks. It undermines successful sustainable fishery management put in place by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. That is why so many fishermen, scientists, and business owners have come out in opposition to the empty oceans act. Many people whose livelihood comes from the sea have expressed reservations about the job-destroying provisions of H.R. 200 and how it poses a threat to the commercial fishing industry and their jobs, which rely on sustainable practices.

The Seafood Harvesters of America, a leading trade organization for fishermen, authored a letter expressing their concerns with the bill. More than 1,000 individuals and organizations have expressed their opposition. I had a number of fishermen come by my office today, telling me that this bill could cost them their jobs.

Since its passage, the goal of Magnuson-Stevens has never wavered: managing fisheries to ensure sustainability while, of course, realizing the potential of the resource. Magnuson-Stevens takes a bottom-up approach to resource management where stakeholders on regional fishery management councils work to meet the science-based criteria outlined by the law.

We have some success with this approach. Since the year 2000, we have seen 44 previously depleted fish stocks rebuilt. Currently, 84 percent of fish stocks are no longer overfished.

In 1976, Magnuson-Stevens was passed to end unregulated fishing predominantly by foreign fleets and to develop our own American fleets that could benefit from our abundant fisheries. The act was strengthened in 1996 and 2006 through bipartisan reauthorizations that established science-based fishery management reforms.

The 1996 reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens bolstered requirements to prevent overfishing and rebuild fish stocks. And, in 2006, a bipartisan authorization maintained the commitment to sustainable fisheries, including accountability and catch limits. These bipartisan efforts succeeded to help create the sustainable fisheries that support coastal economies throughout America and, of course, consumers both in America and worldwide.

Unfortunately, unlike past reauthorizations, H.R. 200 was crafted through a partisan committee process intent on dismantling much of the progress made by Magnuson-Stevens over the last 40 years. In fact, the bill was reported in a party-line vote—Republicans for; Democrats against—with the Republicans continuing to reject attempts to come up with a broad bipartisan approach, as this bill has traditionally been done, that supports both commercial and recreational fishing interests and, of course, maintaining science-based reforms around sustainability.

□ 1315

Sadly, H.R. 200 inserts politics into how we manage our fisheries in several crucial areas. The bill erodes the role that science plays in managing our fisheries.

The bill guts science-based annual catch limit requirements through the creation of many exemptions for key species. These exemptions include many smaller fish that are absolutely critical as prey for valuable commercial and recreational predator species as part of a delicately balanced ecosystem. Hundreds of other species are exempted through this bill which dra-

matically increases the chances that overfishing will occur, leading to the devastation, both for sportsmen and commercial fishermen.

Catch limits are important to help conserve fisheries and are among the most successful provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. By eroding those provisions, this bill would allow for a long-term depletion of fish stocks. It can devastate the economies of local communities, destroy jobs, and threaten the recovery and stability of our ocean ecosystems.

This bill also weakens the data collection requirements that ensure that data-driven, science-based management is used for our fisheries. Data is currently collected through a broad range of sources, and the determination of the best available data is used by NOAA Fisheries and the regional fishery management councils. H.R. 200 would weaken data collection processes and harm the role of science in successful management of our fishery resources.

Weakening science-based provisions is only one of the ways that this bill inserts politics into what should be a scientific question, the management of our fisheries. This bill not only erodes science-based management practices, but it rolls back meaningful accountability requirements for recreational anglers. Large groups representing a few members of the fishing community and businesses that sell equipment and boats want to see that these jobs are sustained over time.

According to data from the Recreational Boating & Fishing Foundation released in May of 2018, participation in recreational fishing has increased for the past 2 years; 49 million Americans went fishing in 2017, an increase over the prior year. So the recreational side is strong under the current provisions of Magnuson-Stevens.

And, of course, recreational fishermen are not the only beneficiaries of the science-based approach. According to the National Marine Manufacturers Association, U.S. sales of boats and marine products increased 7 percent since the last passage in 2016.

So from 2016 to 2017, we saw a number of States: Florida, Texas, Michigan, North Carolina, Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, South Carolina, and Georgia, with double-digit increases in the sales of new boats, engines, trailers, and accessories, creating good jobs for Americans.

Recreational anglers and the businesses that rely upon their support are doing well and thriving, and this growth is a direct result of science-based fishery management practices fostered by Magnuson that this very bill would systematically dismantle, destroying good American jobs.

Instead of destroying jobs, what the Magnuson-Stevens Act does is ensure that our maritime industries will thrive now and in the future. And because of the success of Magnuson-Stevens, U.S. fisheries are stabilizing and rebounding.

With the bill working as intended, it would be absurd to pass this bill and roll back these very policies that have led to job creation and growth, increased enjoyment for recreational fishermen, and better sustainable practices of ecosystem management.

The Empty Oceans Act also inserts dangerous loopholes into Magnuson and it is including exemptions to rebuilding requirements that have helped recover successfully depleted fish stocks.

H.R. 200 potentially exempts hundreds of species from annual catch limits. That can dramatically increase overfishing, and overfishing may seem to some lucrative, or to some fun in the short-term, but of course it has devastating and nonsustainable consequences for our coastal communities that economically depend on the vital industries of recreational fishing and sports fishing.

These exemptions increase the chance of overfishing and lengthen the time it takes to rebuild depleted stocks to healthy levels, if ever.

These loopholes have a devastating effect as well on the commercial fishing industry and on consumers across the country that enjoy eating healthy fish. In 2015, commercial and recreational saltwater fishing generated \$208 billion in revenue, supported 1.6 million jobs, and supported the healthy dining habits of hundreds of millions of American consumers, billions worldwide.

These economic benefits not only support recreational anglers and commercial fishing interests but entire towns and cities that rely on sports fishermen, recreational and commercial, as the entire hub of their economy.

If the Empty Oceans Act were to pass, the long-term prospects of so many communities would be devastated. So I think it is important to have a thoughtful look at how we can continue the bipartisan tradition of building upon the progress of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, making corrections where we need to, but making sure that we put science first in our ocean stewardship, and making sure that we have a sustainable approach to recreational and commercial fishing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The gentleman referenced a letter from the Seafood Harvesters of America. In their letter dated June 21 of 2018, this group claims that section 12 of the bill repeals a section of the MSA. There hasn't been a section 12 in this bill since November of 2017. There is no section 12.

The letter also claims that section 4 undermines rebuilding timelines. Section 4 of this bill simply states that all references in H.R. 200 are to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, unless otherwise stated; doesn't do anything like what is claimed.

As the most egregious example, this group is so committed to opposing this

bill, no matter what changes we make, they reference a bill that, for all intents and purposes, no longer exists.

The gentleman also said something about this bill being job-destroying.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the destruction of jobs. When the present regime was running the fishery in the Gulf of Mexico for red snapper, they limited the number of days for fishing to such a small number that it destroyed hundreds, if not thousands of jobs across just my part of the Gulf Coast when people were no longer allowed to go out and go snapper fishing.

Charter boat folks lost their jobs. People that sell ice or bait lost their jobs. It was the Federal bureaucracy that was destroying jobs.

This bill will give us a commonsense regime that will restore jobs. So, far from being a job-destroying bill, this bill is going to create jobs.

The gentleman also referred to a bottoms-up approach. I have been working on this issue for over 4 years, and I can tell you, the bottom, which is us recreational fishermen, we haven't been listened to one single time by the Federal bureaucracy. They closed their doors in our face.

If you want to have a bottoms-up approach to this sort of thing, this bill supplies it. What we have got right now certainly doesn't do it.

One of the most important things that is involved here is, who does the science? Do you let a bunch of Federal scientists far away from where the fisheries are make these decisions? Or do you let scientists that are in the areas where the fisheries exist, do you let them do the science?

I am not talking about just any Tom, Dick, or Harry out there that calls himself a scientist. I am talking about Ph.D. scientists with accredited universities who know the fishery. This bill would allow that to happen, so that you could get good, accurate data, because they don't have it today.

Let me go back to what I said initially on the red snapper issue.

The Federal scientists were sampling for red snapper on sandy bottom. These are reef fish. You are not going to find reef fish on sandy bottom. You find them on reefs. And if you talk to real scientists, they will tell you there is no way you are going to get an accurate assessment of this fish stock if you are looking for them on sandy bottom. You have got to look for them on reefs.

Let me tell you, there are over 170 groups that have signed on to being supportive of this bill. I do not have time to read all the names to you, but let me just read a few. The first one is the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation. I go to their events up here, like many other Members of Congress. When I was at one just recently, there were hundreds of Members of Congress there from both parties. It couldn't get to be any bigger, and it couldn't get to be any more bipartisan.

The Coastal Conservation Association, the Premier Recreational Anglers

Association in America, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the National Marine Manufacturers Association, which the gentleman referred to as if they were opposed to it. They support the bill.

The National Coalition for Fishing Communities and the Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation. This is a very broadly, deeply supported bill among people who are actually fishing.

Now, it may not be supported by people who don't fish and who don't know anything about fishing; but for those of us who do fish, whether we are commercial fishermen or recreational fishermen, we like it.

And it is time for Congress to understand that the waters of the United States of America do not belong to the Congress, and they do not belong to these Federal departments and agencies. They belong to the people of America, and the people of America have a right to fish in their waters. This bill will help restore that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding me time to voice my opposition to the rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 200.

As it is currently written, H.R. 200 would undermine the conservation gains we have made over the last 2 decades under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, MSA, to prevent overfishing and encourage sustainable fisheries management.

Before reforms were made to the MSA in 1996 and 2006, many fisheries lacked the sustainable quotas and requirements to rebuild depleted stocks. As a result, countless fisheries and fishermen around the country suffered the consequences.

Since Congress changed the law to ensure science-based quotas applied, 44 fisheries around the country have now been restored to healthy levels. The number of stocks that remain overfished is at an all-time low.

H.R. 200 would weaken core sustainability provisions of the MSA. This is a misguided attempt to provide recreational fishermen short-term access at the needless expense of both commercial fishermen and the long-term health of our fisheries. This hurts our coastal communities and businesses that depend on a robust fishing industry and its products.

Additionally, H.R. 200 fails to sufficiently fund stock assessments to ensure effective and efficient management of our Nation's fisheries.

I offered an amendment to authorize an additional \$25 million for stock assessments. These funds would allow NOAA to conduct more fishery surveys, which would yield better data and can help reduce the buffers on fishing quotas.

With this funding and research, fishermen can increase their catch rate,

while decreasing the uncertainty in the sustainability of a fishery. Unfortunately, the majority at the Rules Committee decided not to make my amendment in order—let me repeat that—decided not to make my amendment in order, which would have allowed the House to debate this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative serving the vibrant Central Coast commercial fishing industry in California.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I want to make sure that I can assure him and everybody in this House this bill doesn't cut funding to anything. It's an authorization bill, and it reauthorizes the Magnuson-Stevens Act with some changes, but those changes do not include a reduction in funding.

But here is the thing about fishing that people that don't fish don't understand. Those of us that fish, we care about this fishery more than anybody else because if we overfish the stock, we don't get to fish anymore. No one has a greater interest in making sure that the species in our waters are maintained than those of us that fish, whether we are commercial fishermen or recreational fishermen. So there is no interest here that is being served to try to somehow harm our fishery.

We believe, and it has actually been demonstrated to be true, that local communities, regional people, can better regulate, sample, bring science to the health of these fish stock than giving it to some bureaucrat in Washington that doesn't know one single thing about our fishery.

We care. We care deeply, because it is a way of life for us, and the last thing we want to do is do anything that would harm these fish stock out there.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As we approach another election cycle, it is very important for this institution to do everything we can to ensure transparency and safety in our elections and the integrity of the election system itself.

□ 1330

Our democracy is being threatened by corporations, by special interests, and by foreign powers who are stripping away power from our people and our voters with dark money spending.

Secret spending in our elections has exploded since the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision permitting super-PACs and certain tax-exempt groups to spend unlimited sums, including, in many cases, undisclosed funds. The result is unprecedented levels of spending and a midterm election expected to be the most expensive ever.

Many of these groups don't even have to disclose their donors, allowing wealthy corporations and individuals and illicit foreign influencers to secretly spend unlimited dark money.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative CICILLINE's legislation, H.R. 6239, the DISCLOSE Act, which I am proud to be a cosponsor of. This bicameral bill would require organizations spending money in Federal elections to disclose their donors and guard against hidden foreign interference in our democracy.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is broken. Each day, more and more Americans are losing faith that their government actually works for them. More than 80 percent of Americans say they can't trust Washington to do what is right for them. More than two-thirds feel like our democracy is getting less responsive under Republican control.

And they know what is going on here. They know they are caught in a system that is rigged against them. Their voices are ignored. Their concerns are dismissed. They don't even get a seat at the table.

The Republicans who control this Chamber aren't going to fix it. They have given away all the seats at the table to corporate special interests, to billionaires, to the big banks, the big pharmaceutical companies, and that is why the interests of working people are not being protected. My Republican friends are advancing the interests of powerful special interests that fund their campaigns.

The corruption of our political system in this way has become business as usual here in Washington. In this case, business as usual means billions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy and well-connected Republican campaign donors. It means endless attacks on workers' rights and consumer protections, and it means trying to deny the right to vote to millions of eligible citizens while, at the same time, letting corporations spend as much as it takes to keep Republicans in power.

Business as usual for Republicans is a raw deal for the rest of us, and the American people are sick and tired of the raw deal that they have been getting. Democrats know that. We share their frustration. We know that Congress can do better. We know that we

need to clean up Washington and get a better deal for our democracy.

Democrats are committed to delivering real reforms to our political system that will restore government by and for the people of this great country, and that starts with fixing the way campaigns are run in America. We need to break the stranglehold that secret corporate spending has on our elections, and we have a chance to do it right now.

If we defeat the previous question, we will have a chance to vote on the DISCLOSE Act, one of the key elements of delivering a better deal for our democracy.

The DISCLOSE Act, which I have introduced, along with 162 cosponsors in this Chamber, will shine a light on the unlimited secret corporate spending that has flooded American elections in recent years.

The DISCLOSE Act is simple. It requires that organizations that spend money in Federal elections have to disclose their donors. It closes one of the biggest loopholes that the Citizens United ruling opened, namely, that corporations, billionaires, and even foreign governments can secretly funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into 501(c)(4)s in order to covertly influence our campaigns.

This is a huge problem. From 2004 to 2016, secret political spending in our Presidential elections increased by over 3,000 percent. Special counsel Robert Mueller is even reportedly investigating right now whether Vladimir Putin's regime in Russia secretly funneled money through the NRA to help elect Donald Trump.

And closer to home for all of us, just a few weeks ago, Speaker RYAN's political fundraising group, the American Action Network, reported receiving a single \$24.6 million contribution from an anonymous donor. I don't know who gave the American Action Network that money. You don't know who gave them that money. But I have a feeling that whoever did is expecting something in return.

It is no secret that the American people have lost faith in this institution and in their government. They look to Washington and they see a ruling party that will do whatever it takes to help their friends on Wall Street get ahead, but they won't lift a finger for folks who are struggling to get by.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can restore the faith that has been lost in this institution and in our government. We can build a government that is worthy of the people we serve. We can end the rule of big money and begin a new era where working people get all the seats at the table.

If we want to do that, the first thing we need to do is to make sure that political spending happens out in the open and not in total secret.

Let's defeat the previous question. Let's have a real debate about fixing what is wrong in Washington, and start by passing the DISCLOSE Act to shine

some light on dark money in our politics.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the fisheries of America. If the folks on the other side of the aisle want to address the issue that they just referenced, then I am sure they could foreswear taking any corporate contributions, any anonymous contributions to their accounts for themselves. So they could lead by their example, and I look forward to seeing them do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the fisheries of America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer Mr. CICILLINE's amendment for the DISCLOSE Act. That is why we are talking about that bill today.

The DISCLOSE Act is an alternative to this job-destroying bill and anticonsumer bill that we have before us. So I would encourage my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can shine a light on the dark money that continues to pervade and pollute and distort our political system. I would hope that that is something we can agree on.

I hope my Republican and Democratic friends will vote to defeat the previous question because it doesn't matter what one's ideology is. What matters is there should be transparency in money in politics, and that is a basic tenet that I hope conservatives and liberals and moderates can agree on, and we can immediately move to that. When we defeat the previous question, I will offer that amendment based on the bill by Mr. CICILLINE, which I am honored to be a cosponsor of.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third attempt to undermine the provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that protects jobs and uses science in decision-making with regard to managing our ocean resources. These attempts failed every time, and the biggest reason they failed is the framework of Magnuson is working.

We talked about the increase in boat sales. We talked about the increase in jobs. We talked about the benefit to consumers. I am sure there is some fine tuning to do, but it is not time to push the reset button and start over down a very dangerous path that would destroy jobs and the entire economies of many of our local communities.

This act has been essential, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, in restoring our depleted fishing populations, helping communities devastated by overfishing, getting them back in balance. Science-based reforms over the last two decades have made our fisheries more profitable and rebuilt overfished stocks and have been of great benefit to consumers. These reforms have directly benefited recreational fishing interests, and that is reinforced by their own data of the industry.

So if we continue down the path of sustainable fisheries management, commercial and recreational fishermen will see even greater financial gains and support in the future. In fact, NOAA estimates that fully rebuilt fisheries would add \$31 billion to our economy and create 500,000 new jobs.

We need a benchmark and a path to get there, not a pathway to the past of unsustainable practices and job destruction, which this bill does.

These potential jobs and revenues—\$31 billion, 500,000 jobs—would support thousands of coastal communities throughout America, consumers across our country and the world, far outweighing any short-term benefit from an empty oceans act.

Only through science-based fisheries management can coastal towns and cities reap enormous environmental benefits. So, instead of throwing it away, we should build upon the proven sustainable fisheries management practices of Magnuson-Stevens in a bipartisan way. Unfortunately, this bill halts decades of progress, ends the science-based approach.

Rather than approving harmful and damaging measures to weaken our economy and harm the environment, let's start again and begin a true bipartisan reauthorization, as this Congress did in 1996, as this Congress did in 2006, to reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can move forward with our discussion of requiring that donations into political campaigns and allied groups have to be disclosed and to also vote "no" on the rule so that we begin work on a bipartisan reauthorization of Magnuson-Stevens, building upon the tradition of this institution and putting science in the front.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. There are bipartisan cosponsors to this bill. This is a bipartisan bill.

What is this bill really about? It is about freedom. It is about the freedom of the American people to be able to use their own waters, to fish in their own waters, something the American people have done since before we were a nation.

There is a really great book that just came out that won the Pulitzer Prize called "The Gulf," about the Gulf of Mexico. It recounts the history of our area and how long we have been fishing in the Gulf of Mexico and what it has meant for generations upon generations of both commercial and recreational fishermen.

I have commercial fisherpeople in my family, and they are wonderful people, have a great business. It is important to them and it is their way of life. We need to make sure we do everything to preserve that way of life.

I am a recreational fisherman, and we have been doing it in my family for generations, and I want to preserve that as well.

My grandfather was one of the founders of the Alabama Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo, one of the oldest and largest fishing tournaments in the United States of America. It is really great to see, summer after summer, generations of people who have been fishing in that tournament, literally for three or four or five generations, come down there on Dauphin Island and bring the fish that they catch, so proud of what they have done.

And what have they just done? They have gone out in their own boat at their own expense, spent a day in the open air on a beautiful summer day, or maybe 2 or 3 days, and got some time to spend time together as a family, with friends, and do something Americans have been able to do without the Federal Government trying to tell them how to do it for a couple, 300 years.

It is time for us to restore back to the American people the control of their waters. That is what this bill does. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 965 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 965 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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. 6239) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, Super PACs and other entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 6239.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 985; and

Adoption of House Resolution 985, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—225

Abraham	Fortenberry	Massie
Aderholt	Fox	Mast
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Amash	Gaetz	McCaul
Arrington	Garrett	McClintock
Babin	Gianforte	McHenry
Bacon	Gibbs	McKinley
Banks (IN)	Gohmert	McMorris
Barletta	Goodlatte	McSally
Barr	Gosar	Rodgers
Barton	Gowdy	Meadows
Bergman	Granger	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Griffith	Newhouse
Black	Grothman	Noem
Blackburn	Guthrie	Norman
Bost	Handel	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harris	Olson
Brat	Hartzler	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Palmer
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Buchanan	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Bucshon	Hill	Pittenger
Budd	Holding	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Poliquin
Byrne	Hudson	Posey
Calvert	Huizenga	Ratcliffe
Carter (GA)	Hultgren	Reed
Carter (TX)	Hunter	Reichert
Chabot	Hurd	Renacci
Cloud	Issa	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Joyce (OH)	Rokita
Conaway	Katko	Rooney, Francis
Cook	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Thomas
Costello (PA)	Kelly (PA)	J.
Cramer	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	King (NY)	Roskam
Culberson	Kinzinger	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Rothfus
Curtis	Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer
Davidson	Labrador	Royce (CA)
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Russell
Denham	LaMalfa	Rutherford
DeSantis	Lamborn	Sanford
DesJarlais	Lance	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Schweikert
Donovan	Lesko	Scott, Austin
Duffy	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Long	Shimkus
Dunn	Loudermilk	Simpson
Emmer	Love	Smith (MO)
Estes (KS)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Faso	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Ferguson	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Smucker
Fleischmann	Marino	Stefanik
Flores	Marshall	Stewart

Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguiar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLoach
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo
Españal
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

NOT VOTING—17

Amodei
Blum
Cheney
Costa
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Messer
Napolitano
Perlmutter

□ 1408

Messrs. CAPUANO and DEFazio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BILIRAKIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 184, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—227

Abraham	Gowdy	Palazzo
Aderholt	Granger	Palmer
Allen	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Amash	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Perry
Arrington	Griffith	Pittenger
Babin	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Guthrie	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Handel	Posey
Barletta	Harris	Ratcliffe
Barr	Hartzler	Reed
Barton	Hensarling	Reichert
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Black	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Bost	Huizenga	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (AL)	Hurd	J.
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Burgess	Jones	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Jordan	Russell
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Katko	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Cloud	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kinzing	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Comer	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smucker
Cramer	Latta	Stefanik
Crawford	Lesko	Stewart
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	
Curtis	Long	
Davidson	Loudermilk	
Davis, Rodney	Love	
Denham	Lucas	
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	
DesJarlais	MacArthur	
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	
Donovan	Marino	
Duffy	Marshall	
Duncan (SC)	Mast	
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy	
Dunn	McCaul	
Emmer	McClintock	
Estes (KS)	Faso	
Ferguson	Fitzpatrick	
Fleischmann	Fleischmann	
Flores	Flores	

NOES—184

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Nadler
Barragán	Garamendi	Neal
Bass	Gomez	Nolan
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Beyer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Panetta
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Bonamici	Hastings	Payne
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Pelosi
F.	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peterson
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Polis
Butterfield	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Cohen	Lamb	Schrader
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sinema
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Suoizzi
DeFazio	Loeb	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Titus
Demings	M.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney,	Vargas
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vela
F.	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McEachin	Wasserman
Espallat	McGovern	Schultz
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Foster	Meng	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Blum	Harper	Scott, David
Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Shuster
Costa	Messer	Speier
Ellison	Napolitano	Walz
Gallagher	Perlmutter	Weber (TX)
Hanabusa	Rush	

□ 1418

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR CAPITAL GAZETTE SHOOTING VICTIMS

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 28, a gunman targeted a cherished community newspaper and our Nation's free press, killing five people.

The Capital Gazette is one of our Nation's oldest newspapers, having served

Maryland's capital city of Annapolis for 291 years. In fact, it was one of the first newspapers to publish the Declaration of Independence, although it appeared on page 2 because local news always took precedence.

The Annapolis community, which Congressman SARBANES and I have the privilege of representing, is a tight-knit community. The men and women lost in this horrific attack were friends, neighbors, and extended family members.

We rise to honor the lives of:

Rebecca Smith, who was quiet but had a "big heart" and described herself as a "bonus mom to the best kid ever";

John McNamara, who went by Mac, who loved covering sports as much as playing them;

Gerald Fischman, the consummate newspaperman working 12 hours a day or more, who editorialized about gun violence and became a victim of it;

Rob Hiaasen, a giant in stature and in character, who generously mentored young journalists; and

Wendi Winters, a prolific writer, mother of three Navy officers, and an American hero who charged at the gunman and saved lives.

Those who were senselessly gunned down were members of our valued local press cops. In America, we cherish and value our free and independent press. It is a crucial pillar of our democracy. We should not tolerate threats and hatred directed at the media and should support those who bring us the news every day.

Today, we also honor the brave and swift action by first responders who were on the scene within 1 minute of 911 calls.

Today, we honor the enduring courage of the Capital Gazette staff. Their dedication and service to their readers and their commitment to a vibrant, free press are a tribute to their profession and professionalism and to the resilience of the Annapolis community.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to pause for a moment of silence to honor Rebecca, John, Gerald, Rob, Wendi, and all those impacted by the shooting at the Capital Gazette.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all those in the Chamber to rise for a moment of silence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 985) providing for con-

sideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

YEAS—228

Abraham	Gaetz	McKinley
Aderholt	Garrett	McMorris
Allen	Gianforte	Rodgers
Amash	Gibbs	McSally
Amodei	Gohmert	Meadows
Arrington	Goodlatte	Messer
Babin	Gosar	Mitchell
Bacon	Gowdy	Moolenaar
Banks (IN)	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Barr	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Barton	Graves (MO)	Noem
Bergman	Griffith	Norman
Biggs	Grothman	Nunes
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Olson
Bishop (MI)	Handel	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Palmer
Black	Hartzler	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hensarling	Pearce
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Perry
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Poliquin
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Posey
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe
Buck	Hudson	Reed
Bucshon	Huizenga	Reichert
Budd	Hultgren	Renacci
Burgess	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Byrne	Hurd	Roby
Calvert	Issa	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Cloud	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Coffman	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Cole	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	J.
Collins (NY)	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Conaway	King (IA)	Rothfus
Cook	King (NY)	Rouzer
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger	Royce (CA)
Cramer	Knight	Russell
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Culberson	Labrador	Sanford
Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Scalise
Curtis	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Davidson	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Latta	Sessions
DeSantis	Lesko	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Lewis (MN)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Donovan	Long	Smith (NE)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Love	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Smucker
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Emmer	MacArthur	Stewart
Estes (KS)	Marchant	Stivers
Faso	Marino	Taylor
Ferguson	Marshall	Tenney
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Mast	Thornberry
Flores	McCarthy	Tipton
Fortenberry	McCaul	Trott
Fox	McClintock	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Upton

Valadao Webster (FL)
Wagner Wenstrup
Walberg Westerman
Walden Williams
Walker Wilson (SC)
Walorski Wittman
Walters, Mimi Womack

NAYS—184

Adams Gabbard
Aguilar Gallego
Barragán Garamendi
Bass Gomez
Beatty Gonzalez (TX)
Bera Gottheimer
Beyer Green, Al
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
Blumenauer Grijalva
Blunt Rochester Gutiérrez
Bonamici Hastings
Boyle, Brendan Heck
F. Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA) Himes
Brown (MD) Hoyer
Brownley (CA) Huffman
Bustos Jackson Lee
Butterfield Jayapal
Capuano Jeffries
Carbajal Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Cartwright Keating
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX) Kennedy
Chu, Judy Khanna
Cicilline Kihuen
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Cleaver Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn Kuster (NH)
Cohen Lamb
Connolly Langevin
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Correa Larson (CT)
Courtney Lawrence
Crist Lawson (FL)
Crowley Lee
Cuellar Levin
Cummings Lewis (GA)
Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted
Davis, Danny Lipinski
DeFazio Loeb sack
DeGette Lofgren
Delaney Lowenthal
DeLauro Lowey
DelBene Lujan Grisham,
Demings M.
DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray
Deutch Lynch
Dingell Maloney,
Doggett Carolyn B.
Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
F. Matsui
Engel McCollum
Eshoo McEachin
Españillat McGovern
Esty (CT) McNerney
Evans Meeks
Foster Meng
Frankel (FL) Moore
Fudge Moulton

NOT VOTING—16

Blum Harper
Cheney Jenkins (KS)
Costa Napolitano
Ellison Perlmutter
Gallagher Rush
Hanabusa Serrano

□ 1430

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 183, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

NOES—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Blum
Cheney
Costa
Ellison
Gallagher
Hanabusa
Harper
Jenkins (KS)
Lewis (GA)
Napolitano
Perlmutter
Ruppersberger
Rush
Shuster
Speier
Walz

□ 1437

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1898

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1898, a bill originally introduced by Representative Meehan of Pennsylvania, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprints pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE AND THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the

Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 256) expressing support for the countries of Eastern Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving my right to object, although I don't intend to object, I want to, first of all, thank the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor.

The Foreign Affairs Committee marked up this resolution awhile back. It passed unanimously, and we were under the impression that it might come up for debate on Tuesday under suspension. That is what should have happened.

Members should have had the opportunity to debate this in the House before the NATO summit meeting began this morning, and sent a clear message that this body stands with NATO, that we support this alliance, the most successful in history, that our allies can count on American leadership and American resolve.

Instead, we are rushing it through today, after the summit is halfway over and after President Trump has again insulted our closest friends on the global stage.

This is an important resolution. It should not be swept under the rug because it is important that this body stand up for NATO, even if we are late to the game.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 256

Whereas the United States has shown strong commitment to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic development of the countries that emerged from the ashes of the former Soviet Union and the communist bloc it once dominated;

Whereas many of these countries have, during the past three decades, undertaken the considerable political and economic reforms necessary to achieve the aspirations for European and Euro-Atlantic integration, or are continuing to do so;

Whereas the incorporation of Eastern European countries into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has contributed toward a vision of Europe that is aimed at promoting stability and cooperation, at building a Europe whole and free, united in peace, democracy and common values;

Whereas the mission of NATO since its founding in 1949 is to promote democratic values, cooperation on defense and security issues, and the peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas NATO remains the most important and critical security link between the United States and Europe;

Whereas NATO allies and partners in Central and Eastern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint peace operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas Russia's aggressive actions against neighboring members of the NATO Alliance and nearby NATO partner countries, including its many violations of Baltic airspace, occupation of Georgian territory in 2008, annexation of Crimea in 2014, and continued threats to Moldovan territorial integrity and sovereignty, not only violate its commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreements but are also key contributors to Europe's instability;

Whereas NATO reaffirmed its military security commitment to the Baltic States in response to increased Russian military activities;

Whereas NATO allies increased their assistance to NATO partner countries by endorsing the Substantial NATO-Georgia Package in support of Georgia at the Wales Summit, the Comprehensive Assistance Package in support of Ukraine at the Warsaw Summit, and developed a phased Defense and Related Security Capacity Building package in support of Moldova;

Whereas the European Reassurance Initiative represents the United States commitment to enduring peace, stability, and territorial integrity in Europe as members and partners of the NATO Alliance;

Whereas British Prime Minister Theresa May stated, "On defense and security cooperation, we're united in our recognition of NATO as the bulwark of our collective defense and we reaffirmed our unshakable commitment to this alliance. We're 100% behind NATO.";

Whereas Estonian President Kersti Kaljulaid stated, "Our NATO allies can rely on us to act as agreed in recent summits in Chicago, Wales and Warsaw, our UN partners have appreciated and respected our role in peacekeeping operations and our European partners know that Estonia is a reliable partner when there is a crisis" and Estonian Prime Minister Jüri Ratas stated, "Our commitment to NATO is steadfast.";

Whereas Latvian President Raimonds Vējonis stated, "We [Latvia] continue increasing our defense spending consistently on our own, and our allies appreciate that. A historic decision on deployment of four multinational battalions in the Baltic States and Poland was made at the NATO Summit in Warsaw this summer. This is by far the most serious proof of NATO's readiness to defend independence of the Eastern European countries, including Latvia.";

Whereas Czech Republic Prime Minister Bohuslav Sobotka stated, "NATO is the basis for our security" and that he hopes "the United States will remain a solid NATO partner.";

Whereas the United States must remain committed to our NATO allies in the face of any aggression irrespective of their ability to meet the NATO benchmark of spending: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of the Baltic States;

(2) condemns the clear, gross, and uncorrected ongoing violation of the Helsinki principles by the Russian Federation with respect to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(3) supports keeping United States sanctions imposed against Russia relating to Cri-

mea in effect until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea has been restored, as well as sanctions relating to the Donbas until the Minsk agreements are fully implemented;

(4) considers it essential for the United States to maintain and increase political, economic, and security support for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;

(5) appreciates the spirit of friendship of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including those of the Western Balkans, their commitment to collective security, and their contributions, past and present, to peace operations around the globe;

(6) supports keeping the door to NATO membership open to those countries that are eligible to join the Alliance and meet all the necessary requirements for membership;

(7) supports and encourages the democratic aspirations of the people of all countries concerned, including Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova; and

(8) calls for continued support to the United States European Reassurance Initiative.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after resolving clause and insert the following:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms the United States enduring commitment to and friendship with its NATO allies;

(2) pledges that the United States will continue to maintain strong leadership and strengthen its commitments to NATO;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of NATO allies;

(4) condemns the clear, gross, and uncorrected ongoing violation of the Helsinki principles by Russia with respect to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine;

(5) supports keeping United States sanctions imposed against Russia relating to Crimea in effect until Ukraine's sovereignty over Crimea has been restored, as well as sanctions relating to the Donbas until the Minsk agreements are fully implemented;

(6) considers it essential for the United States to maintain and increase political, economic, and security support for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe;

(7) appreciates the spirit of friendship of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including those of the Western Balkans, their commitment to collective security, and their contributions, past and present, to peace operations around the globe;

(8) calls for the United States to continue to support the countries of Central and Eastern Europe to secure their electoral processes from foreign threats;

(9) supports and encourages the democratic aspirations of the people of all countries concerned, including Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova;

(10) encourages the countries of Europe to continue to invest in the individual, regional, and collective defense;

(11) calls on all NATO allies whose current proportion of gross domestic product spent on defense is below the 2 percent guideline to meet that guideline;

(12) honors the men and women who served under NATO and gave their lives to promote peace, security, and international cooperation since 1949; and

(13) calls for continued support to the United States' European Deterrence Initiative.

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY
MR. ROYCE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROYCE of California. I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the United States has shown strong commitment to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and democratic development of the countries that emerged from the ashes of the former Soviet Union and the communist bloc it once dominated;

Whereas many of these countries have, during the past three decades, undertaken the extensive political and economic reforms necessary to achieve their aspirations for European and Euro-Atlantic integration, or are continuing to do so;

Whereas the incorporation of Central and Eastern European countries into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has contributed to a vision of Europe that is whole and free and united in peace, democracy, and common values;

Whereas the mission of NATO since its founding in 1949 is to defend its members from aggression, enhance cooperation on defense and security issues, and promote the peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas NATO remains the most important and critical security link between the United States and Europe;

Whereas on November 16, 2016, former President Barack Obama stated, "NATO, the world's greatest alliance, is as strong and as ready as it's ever been and I am confident that just as America's commitment to the transatlantic alliance has endured for seven decades—whether it's been under a Democratic or Republican administration—that commitment will continue, including our pledge and our treaty obligation to defend every ally.";

Whereas on July 6, 2017, President Donald J. Trump reiterated the United States' support of NATO by saying, "To those who would criticize our tough stance, I would point out that the United States has demonstrated not merely with words but with its actions that we stand firmly behind Article 5, the mutual defense commitment.";

Whereas NATO allies and partners in Central and Eastern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint peace operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas NATO established the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council to promote, among other priorities, counter-terrorism, non-proliferation, and crisis management cooperation as well as advancing values, including respect of international law and peaceful resolution of disputes;

Whereas Russia's aggressive actions against members of the NATO Alliance and

nearby NATO partner countries, including its many violations of Baltic airspace, occupation of Georgian territory in 2008, illegal occupation of Crimea since 2014, and continued threats to Moldovan territorial integrity and sovereignty, not only violate its commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreements but also foment instability in Europe;

Whereas NATO allies increased their assistance to NATO partner countries by endorsing the Substantial NATO-Georgia Package in support of Georgia at the Wales Summit, the Comprehensive Assistance Package in support of Ukraine at the Warsaw Summit, and developed a phased Defense and Related Security Capacity Building package in support of Moldova;

Whereas the European Deterrence Initiative represents the United States commitment to enduring peace, stability, and territorial integrity in Europe as members and partners of the NATO Alliance;

Whereas from September 14 through September 20, 2017, Russia held a large-scale military exercise in Belarus known as Zapad 2017;

Whereas the last Zapad exercise was in 2013 which laid the foundations for Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea;

Whereas NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg expressed concerns about Russia's lack of transparency regarding military exercises;

Whereas Secretary-General Stoltenberg also stated, "Russia is our neighbor.... We don't want to isolate Russia; we don't want a new Cold War.";

Whereas the Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Russia, Valery Gerasimov, wrote in 2013 that "informational conflict" is a key part of war;

Whereas Baltic and NATO officials believe that Russia was likely responsible for interruptions in Latvia's mobile communications network before the Zapad exercise;

Whereas three Baltic Russian-language news sites known collectively as Baltnews are secretly owned by Rossiya Segodnya, a news agency owned and operated by the Russian Government;

Whereas on June 28, 2017, Vesko Garcevic, Montenegro's ambassador to NATO from 2010 through 2014, testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that Russia has provided support to extremist groups and even used the country's religious institutions to oppose closer ties to the Western world;

Whereas on April 4, 2018, Russia began a live-fire military exercise in the Baltic Sea, just outside of the territorial waters of NATO member countries, in a move a top Latvian defense official called a "show of force" just a day after Baltic leaders met with President Trump;

Whereas at the Wales Summit in 2014, all 28 members of the NATO alliance declared their intention to move towards a minimum security investment of 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense within a decade;

Whereas on June 8, 2018, NATO Secretary-General Stoltenberg spoke of increases in defense investments by European allies, that "Allies are making real progress on all aspects of burden sharing, cash, capabilities and contributions... But of course, we still have more work to do. Burden sharing will be a key theme of our Summit next month. And I expect all Allies to continue their efforts."; and

Whereas the commitment to collective defense in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty remains at the heart of the Alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. ROYCE of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution expressing support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

□ 1445

CROOKED RIVER RANCH FIRE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2075) to adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities in order to protect adjacent private property, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2075

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Crooked River Ranch is an unincorporated community with a population of 5,000 residents.

(2) The current lands located adjacent to Crooked River Ranch are managed by the Bureau of Land Management and are classified as a Wilderness Study Area.

(3) There is currently only one entrance/exit to the Crooked River Ranch.

(4) Jefferson County and Crooked River Ranch have determined that the Wilderness Study Area lands are in the highest risk category for exposure to devastating wildfire due to overstocked juniper stands under the federally mandated and locally promulgated Jefferson County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

(5) The current Wilderness Study Area classification prevents mechanical fire prevention activities within the overstocked juniper stands.

(6) Advancing this proposed legislation will greatly enhance the life and safety of people and property by reducing the extreme fire threat to these lands.

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, DESCHUTES CANYON-STEELHEAD FALLS AND DESCHUTES CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS, OREGON.

(a) *BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT REQUIRED.*—The Secretary of the Interior shall adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area and the Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Area in the State of Oregon to exclude approximately 832 acres, as depicted on the map entitled “Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area” and dated April 6, 2017, in order to facilitate fire prevention and response activities on the excluded public lands and adjacent private property.

(b) *EFFECT OF EXCLUSION.*—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the public lands to be excluded from the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area and the Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Area pursuant to subsection (a) are no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Crooked River Ranch is a residential community that is home to approximately 5,500 people. It is located between the Deschutes and Crooked Rivers in Jefferson County, Oregon. Because of this geography, there is only one all-weather road in and out of Crooked River Ranch.

Now, right next to this community, along the Deschutes River, is a roughly 3,200-acre Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area, which is managed—or, more accurately, is mismanaged—by the Bureau of Land Management. This BLM property is thick with vegetation, which poses a very real risk for catastrophic wildfires, in large part because the wilderness study area regulations greatly restrict essential measures for both fire mitigation and firefighting.

For example, in a wilderness or wilderness study area, you can't use mechanized or motorized equipment or transport. This includes chainsaws as well as electrical generators, trucks, and larger equipment essential to fuels management. You can't even use this equipment to cut fire breaks. You can't build fire roads. You can't do mechanical thinning of vegetation. Even the hand thinning that is allowed in such areas is very limited.

Absent a waiver from the Secretary of the Interior, firefighters can't drop fire retardant or use bulldozers to cut

fire breaks in the wilderness study area during a fire. Tragically, the benign neglect mandated by these requirements has made all wilderness areas firetraps just waiting for a lighting flash or a careless match.

H.R. 2075, authored by Congressman GREG WALDEN, with the support of the local community, would slightly modify the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls Wilderness Study Area, making it possible to manage the land properly to reduce fuel loads that threaten the neighborhoods in Crooked River Ranch.

The boundary change will reduce the WSA by about 830 acres, but this small change will promote public safety, allow for more efficient fuels treatments on the lands immediately adjacent to Crooked River Ranch, and give critically important flexibility to local firefighters should fire break out in that area.

This is an issue of public safety, and this bill will clearly help protect the lives and property of the thousands of Crooked River Ranch residents from wildfire.

I commend Congressman WALDEN for his work to provide a commonsense solution to a very real public safety concern. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Crooked River Ranch Fire Protection Act removes 830 acres from the wilderness study area in central Oregon. The land is adjacent to a rural subdivision, and its removal from WSA will arguably make it easier for the local community and the BLM to plan wildfire mitigation projects.

While we take issue with the point that the WSA designation limits mechanical thinning and other necessary forest treatments, the area is not suitable for wilderness designation, and the release from the WSA makes sense.

However, we still have concerns with this bill, because it ignores the collaborative process that was trying to develop a comprehensive plan for the entire area. That plan would have led to lasting conservation gains by designating wilderness and would have done even more to protect the community from wildfire by creating special management areas adjacent to Crooked River Ranch. Unfortunately, the collaborative group stalled out after this legislation was introduced.

Only Congress can permanently change the status of a wilderness study area. Whenever we choose to make a permanent change, we have a responsibility to consider the whole picture and listen to all stakeholders.

While it is disappointing that we are unable to fulfill that commitment with this legislation, we understand the need to prioritize safety of the Crooked River Ranch residents.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the author of this legislation and the elected representative of this threatened community.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MCCLINTOCK and my friend from Arizona for their work on this, especially Chairman BISHOP as well. The Natural Resources Committee has been terrific to work with on this measure over a period of time.

The bill is really an important public safety measure. This is a life-and-death measure. There are more than 5,000 people who live in Crooked River Ranch. This is an unincorporated community in central Oregon. It is wedged between two river systems, river canyons.

You can see it here on this map. I want to point out the two rivers here. It is actually on a peninsula. It sits up. These are deep canyons. To the west over here is where the wilderness study area is that we are talking about. It is juniper. It is cheatgrass. It is sagebrush. These are the most volatile fuels you can have.

Unlike here on the East Coast, where in the summer you get thunderstorms and heavy rain with it, out in Oregon, we have humidity. We call it rain that stays in the ground. But in the summer, we don't get that. What we get is dry lightning and very little rain. When lightning strikes occur in that kind of vegetation, it explodes.

I have talked to the firefighters, and I will show you what happens when this happens. This the terrain. The overstocked juniper, you can see it over here. This is very volatile terrain. That is grasslands. As I say, there are all kinds of other volatile fuels in there.

This is at the highest risk category for exposure to catastrophic wildfire. The wildfire planning community protection plan calls it that in Jefferson County.

Fire season is already underway in central Oregon. In fact, wildfires have already burned 120,000 acres so far this year. It has just gotten started. By the way, that is the equivalent of burning about 2½ times the entire size of Washington, D.C.

So what does that look like? When fire gets into these junipers, they basically explode. It is very volatile. Jefferson County Sheriff Jim Adkins took this picture out of his rig of the Graham fire. This fire nearby—not right at Crooked River Ranch, but in the same county—burned a few weeks ago. It burned two homes. Altogether, it burned about 2,000 acres—2,000 acres—and a couple of homes before they could get in and get it out.

So what we are doing here with this legislation is removing 832 acres. That is it. Three-thousandths of 1 percent of all the WSAs in Oregon, three-thousandths of 1 percent of the acreage, 832 acres, we are saying that we are just going to take it back to the rim of the canyon, and, on that flat land, you can go in and thin out these junipers and get it back to where you can do fire management.

Now, when I have talked to the fire chiefs and crews there, they have told me: Look, in this community of 5,000, there is one road in and out.

If you have a fire that blows up like this out on the peninsula, out on the end, the fire chiefs basically said: If the conditions are wrong and there is wind, I am not going to put my firefighters' lives at risk, so we will probably not go in and fight that fire. We will just try and get people out.

Can you imagine, on a two-lane road, trying to evacuate more than 5,000 people with a monster fire breathing down your back? That is what we are trying to avoid here.

This WSA was determined in 1992 by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to not be suitable for inclusion as wilderness. They said: No, it doesn't meet the criteria. It should not be included.

But the way the Federal law works, once the agency decides to study one of these areas, all the restrictions come on the land. As you have heard from both sides of the aisle—well, at least our side of the aisle—that means that you can't go in and do mechanical thinning. You can't do the kind of work we need to do.

By the way, if there is a fire, it takes all kinds of permission to drop the retardant or to get in there with mechanical means.

All we are saying is, let's back that up 832 acres along the rim line, send people in, thin this back to where it is in balance and will not cause devastating wildfire to consume Crooked River Ranch. Let's look at what happens when that does occur.

You will remember this tragedy from my friend's home State in Santa Rosa, California. You don't think fires are monsters and killers and deadly? Look at what happened to this community, the homes and lives that were lost.

This is what we are trying to prevent from happening at Crooked River Ranch. With bipartisan support, the House is going to show its will today, and I think overwhelmingly, to say this is a measured, thoughtful piece of legislation with enormous support in the community and the county that will prevent a Santa Rosa from occurring at Crooked River Ranch.

Remember, there is one way in and one way out, and 5,500 people who live in this area.

I thank the gentleman from Alaska for his leadership on this. He and his staff have been terrific.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I know we have some differences about adding other things in. That can be dealt with, discussed at another time, but we have a serious and deadly threat staring us down every summer. We have fires already burning in the area.

If we want to save lives and prevent deadly fires, this is the bill to do it. This is the time to do it. Let's get it done.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the more than 5,000 residents

of the Crooked River Ranch and in the name of common sense, I ask for passage of this vital public safety measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2075, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to adjust the eastern boundary of the Deschutes Canyon-Steelhead Falls and Deschutes Canyon Wilderness Study Areas in the State of Oregon to facilitate fire prevention and response activities to protect private property, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of the clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 5895) "An Act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.", disagreed to by the House and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MURPHY, be the conferees on the part of the Senate, with instructions.

STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in H.R. 200.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 965 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 200.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1457

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

consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the sponsors of the original bill way back in 1975, and I fought to secure enactment in 1976, I can say it is probably the most successful legislation that ever passed this House to create a sustainable yield of fisheries for the United States of America.

I first wrote what would become the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and it hasn't been reauthorized since 2006. For 6 years, I have worked with Members of this body on both sides of the aisle to improve this legislation.

I know some of my colleagues will say that I didn't do enough to ensure the act retains the strong bipartisan nature of the original bill. It is important to remember the legislative history. While it is true that the version of the Magnuson-Stevens Act that became law passed the House under suspension of the rules, the original bill passed the Natural Resources Committee after a long markup by a vote of 26-15, with only four Democrats voting in favor of the bill.

□ 1500

So this point that the previous reauthorizations were noncontroversial and nonpartisan is not true.

My legislation, H.R. 200, would make a number of improvements to the original act in order to ensure a proper balance between the biological needs of fish stocks and the economic needs of fishermen in coastal communities.

The legislation tailors Federal fishery authorities in order to give councils the proper tools and flexibility needed to effectively manage their fisheries, and will support a more robust domestic seafood industry and greater job creation across the country.

This legislation allows added flexibility for fishery managers to rebuild depleted fisheries, more transparency for fishermen in science and management, and a requirement for NOAA to provide better accountability on how fees are collected and used. It also authorizes appropriations for the act for 5 years.

I am proud to say my bill protects our commercial and recreational fishing interests, and will allow councils to do their job in a more streamlined and effective manner.

My bill would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Act. It allows for regional management of fisheries. The law gives guidance through its national standards and creates the process that allows the councils to develop fishery management plans.

This legislation was written for fishermen to ensure they are able to catch sustainable yields of fish for the communities. It is critical for the protection of coastal communities and for allowing the stakeholders to be part of the management of the fisheries.

To address the ever-changing needs of fisheries and fishery communities, Congress has passed various amendments to this act. Changes were based on knowledge of the times gained through experience, improvements in science, and better management techniques.

In the mid-1990s, Congress addressed overfishing, included protections of habitat, improvements for fisheries science, and reductions in bycatch. These were the issues of the time, and they were addressed as needed. One of these problems also included the lack of resources to fund stock assessments to provide needed data to the regional fishery management councils, something that continues to be an issue today.

The act was last amended in 2007. Congress included measures that set science-based annual catch limits to prevent overfishing, including a requirement to end overfishing within 2 years. Accountability measures were adopted, which meant harvest reductions if harvest levels were exceeded.

Work to develop H.R. 200 began 6 years ago. The committee held over a dozen hearings, with testimony from over 100 witnesses. As with past reauthorizations, and in line with a main purpose of the act—to balance conservation with economic use of the resource—H.R. 200 takes a middle-of-the-road approach to fisheries management.

While some today may complain the bill's flexibility rolls back scientific protections, that statement is just not accurate. The flexibility in the bill is based on science. Rebuilding of fish stocks will be based on the biology of fish stock. Harvest levels will still be based on science and set at levels where overfishing will not occur. The regional councils will continue to follow recommendations of their science and statistical committee.

During every reauthorization cycle, the Magnuson-Stevens Act is updated to be closely in sync with current-day science, management techniques, and knowledge. As the fishermen, communities, councils, and fishery managers develop better techniques and learn lessons from implementing the law,

Congress can take that knowledge to improve that law. Flexibility is a cornerstone of the law. The Magnuson-Stevens Act promotes regional flexibility that recognizes differing ocean conditions, variations in regional fisheries, different harvesting methods and management techniques, and distinct community impacts.

Again, I want to stress: this bill was written for fish and communities, not for the interest groups. I will not stand by and watch other interest groups hijack this piece of legislation, taking away the sustainable concept of our fisheries and the healthy concept of our communities for other reasons and other causes.

While my name will be on the bill as the sponsor, we all know that bringing legislation to the floor is a group effort and we would not be here today talking about fish without the support of other members and a tremendous amount of hard work from staff. So I thank Chairman BISHOP and even Congressman HUFFMAN and his staff—I had to say that—the bill's cosponsors on both sides of the aisle; staff on the Natural Resources Committee, Lisa Pittman, Charles Park, Richie O'Connell, Bill Ball, and former staffer Dave Whaley; and members of my staff, Mike DeFilippis and Martha Newell.

Mr. Chairman, I have to remind people that when we had this bill passed originally, we were catching about, I would say, 2 percent of our fish, and after the passage of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we are catching all but 1 percent and foreign countries are only catching 1 percent.

This is a good piece of legislation. It has worked in the past, and it will work better in the future.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is our country's most important fisheries law. Magnuson is the framework for governing fishing in Federal waters, which is big business in this country: The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that commercial and recreational fishing generates roughly \$200 billion in economic value and supports 1.7 million jobs.

This significant economic impact depends on sustainable management of fish stocks and protecting the ocean ecosystems on which they depend. Now, the 1996 and 2006 reauthorizations of Magnuson moved us in that direction after decades of overfishing had led to the collapse of fisheries and devastation for fishing communities in many parts of the country.

Instead of building on that success, I am sad to say that H.R. 200, which many have called the empty oceans act, would roll back the important conservation and management standards

that have helped us get to this point, that have helped end overfishing, and that have helped rebuild a record number of fish stocks. This attempt to return us to the bad old days of failed fishery management policy and overfishing that inevitably follows from loose standards should be seen as unacceptable to everyone who cares about sustainable fisheries.

Now, Magnuson, as has been said, has traditionally been a bipartisan effort. I have tried to work with Mr. YOUNG in good faith to find a path towards a bipartisan compromise, and I thank him for his efforts to get there. We came close. I am disappointed that we fell short.

But we need to be very clear that Democrats are opposing H.R. 200 not for partisan reasons, but for important policy grounds that, in the past, have never been partisan and should not be partisan today.

That is also why many fishery stakeholders oppose this bill in its current form. They don't want to see Magnuson's core conservation provisions undermined. That is why letters have been pouring in in opposition to this bill, because it does undermine the very heart of our country's flagship fisheries law.

We have heard, for example, from the Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association, Fishing Communities Coalition, Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance, Seafood Harvesters of America, Maine Coast Fishermen's Association, Marine Fish Conservation Network, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association, Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance, Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Gulf Restoration Network, American Fly Fishing Tackle Association, and on and on, including hundreds of chefs, scientists, and recreational anglers, among others. In fact, the stack of letters that we have received is quite voluminous, as I have them right here.

The changes my Republican colleagues are proposing to Magnuson are irresponsible. I am disappointed that they are ignoring the concerns that have been expressed from so many stakeholders who are telling them to be more careful as we reauthorize this important bill. There is an old saying: If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

The bottom line with this Magnuson reauthorization is this: the law is working as intended. Reauthorization is important, but it shouldn't come at the expense of the law's core provisions that have made it so successful.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an alternate amendment to reauthorize Magnuson. It contains constructive, bipartisan ideas on how to best manage our fisheries by allowing for flexibility and modernizing aspects of fisheries management, but doing so without undermining the core provisions of the law.

As an angler myself, who represents many commercial and recreational fishing interests in northern California, I strongly believe that there

needs to be a bipartisan path forward. I would still very much like to have meaningful discussions with my colleagues across the aisle to develop legislation in the spirit of previous bipartisan Magnuson reauthorizations, while leaving the core conservation and management provisions intact.

We can also make progress and do more to support recreational fishing interests. We should do that together, without sacrificing the science-based framework that is so important to the long-term sustainability of fisheries management.

Unfortunately, H.R. 200 falls short in this regard, and I must request that my colleagues vote “no” on the bill in its current form.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

Not only does this bill reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which is long overdue, but it also updates the language of the act to put more power in the hands of local councils to manage their fisheries effectively. One-size-fits-all approaches rarely work, so I am proud to cosponsor this bill which allows local councils to tailor management plans to the needs of their regions.

Further, this bill would lift burdens of outdated, arbitrary scientific practices and data which limit the American people’s access to affordable domestically caught fish. The seafood industry is economically booming and it is past time that we lift these restricting regulations and allow a win for not only the recreational fishermen, which I have been a lifelong proponent of and a participant, but also of our commercial fishermen, the American people will be a winner as well, so I urge a vote for this bill.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his eloquent defense of our oceans, and also for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 200.

I represent the great State of Maine, with a rich maritime heritage, strong fisheries, and vibrant coastal communities that I am very proud to represent.

The hardworking men and women who earn their livings on or near the water in my State have been working for decades to follow the Magnuson-Stevens Act and Federal fishery policy. They are responsible stewards of our ocean resources. And while the current law could certainly be improved, it has been successful in allowing Mainers

and others to support their families while restoring and preserving the health of their fisheries. They want to pass this maritime heritage on to the next generation, and I am afraid this bill would make that task even harder for them.

The bill before us today, therefore, is a big disappointment to me because it misses the opportunity to update the Magnuson-Stevens Act. By reauthorizing Magnuson, we could work in a bipartisan way to address the current needs of our fisheries and provide more flexibility. We could bring Federal policy further into the 21st century.

This bill is the wrong approach for addressing fishery management. It weakens rebuilding requirements, creates loopholes in some conservation efforts, and has the effect of decreasing accountability that has been put in place to prevent overfishing.

H.R. 200 undoes efforts that have been proven to work, while failing to address some significant challenges in our fisheries. It is a lost opportunity and a bill that I cannot support.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my good friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. I am a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Louisiana has a heavy presence of both commercial and recreational anglers, and they all know that reforms have been needed to our Federal fisheries data collection systems for decades.

In some cases, especially in relation to the red snapper fishery in the Gulf, rebuilding schedules, season lengths, and catch limits have been based off data models from the 1980s. Technology has come a long way since then, with universities and the Gulf States themselves utilizing new methods of data collection that are producing positive results that are at odds with the 1980s numbers that the Federal Government has been using.

This bill will go a long way in promoting a modern science-backed approach to management of our fisheries.

This reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Management Act provides flexibility and stability that will promote economic expansion through enhanced public access and opportunity for recreational fishing in saltwater.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, Congressman YOUNG, for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

□ 1515

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 200, the so-called Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, which would undermine the years of progress made in rebuilding fish stocks and setting effective catch limits under the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

My home State of Rhode Island is home to a vibrant fishing community that relies on healthy fish populations in order to make a living.

Traditionally, reauthorization of fisheries management programs through the Magnuson-Stevens Act has been done on a bipartisan basis with the goal of strengthening sustainable fisheries. However, this entirely partisan bill weakens critical tools, like annual catch limits, which ensure that fisheries remain full for years to come.

This bill will gut science-based management for fisheries, roll back development of effective fisheries management techniques, and reduce accountability for recreational fisheries.

H.R. 200 removes several species from science-based quotas which help ensure that catches are sustainable each year. Under this bill, hundreds of species of fish would no longer have catch limits, which would lead to drastic overfishing.

The bill also harms efforts to rebuild fish stocks by including loopholes which remove rebuilding timeframes from many fish stocks and would extend recovery timeframes for others, thereby endangering healthy stocks of fish available to fishing communities.

In the last week, I have heard from fishermen from all over my district, from Greenville to Portsmouth, who have reached out to my office to tell me that H.R. 200 will harm their way of life by threatening already depleted fish populations and increase the threat of overfishing.

The fishermen in my State need legislation that would build on time-tested tools to strengthen fisheries and prevent overfishing instead of this bill, which would set management programs back and weaken effective conservation tools.

I join with those fishermen in opposing this misguided approach to reauthorizing the Magnuson-Stevens Act. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “no” on final passage.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the dean of the House, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman emeritus, I think, for most committees in the Congress and many other great accomplishments for yielding time and for all the work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I find this whole debate interesting in that I have heard speaker after speaker come up on the other side of the aisle talking about the importance of their fisheries, talking about how this bill is going to ruin

resource management and sustainability of fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you to take a look at this poster right here, and I will also spout out just a few statistics.

Between my home State of Louisiana and the dean's home State of Alaska, I believe we have more than half of the commercial fisheries landings in the United States, and as demonstrated here, we have more than half of the recreational fishing in the United States.

I appreciate the concerns that are being raised, but I am not sure whom they are representing. We represent the recreational fishers. We have the largest commercial fishing industries in the United States.

What this bill does is this bill simply updates the science. It allows for updated science. It allows to build upon successful practices that have been carried out by States for coastal fisheries, for inland fisheries, allowing for better techniques, allowing for better science to ensure the sustainability of the fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, how rational is it that someone who represents Louisiana—and I also want to point to the comments that my colleague from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) made a few minutes ago. We both represent the coast of Louisiana. How rational is it that the two of us and the gentleman who represents the entire State of Alaska would come out and advocate for policies that would undermine the sustainability of fisheries in two incredibly important industries in our State? That is completely nonsensical.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, this bill is bipartisan. It is why we have bipartisan support for this legislation by those who have cosponsored it. It is why the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation; the National Coalition for Fishing Communities; the National Marine Manufacturers Association; the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership; the Coastal Conservation Association, or CCA; Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation; Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission; Center for Sport Fishing Policy; Freezer Longline Coalition; Mississippi State Legislature; Johnny Morris, who is the CEO of Bass Pro Shops; American Scallop Association; Garden State Seafood Association; West Coast Seafood Processors Association; Lund's Seafood; North Carolina Fisheries Association; Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association; Gulf Coast Seafood Alliance; Southeastern Fisheries Association; and many, many others that have a genuine stake in the sustainability of our fisheries, some of the leaders in conservation in our fisheries, are supportive of this legislation.

So let me say it again, Mr. Chairman, this bill improves science. It uses updated science.

I am not going to point to the decades-long tenure of my friend, but I think the original legislation perhaps could use some updating, and so this

updates the science, and it provides for more transparency in the science and allows for public participation. These are all good things that we need to be supporting.

I do appreciate the input by my friend from California on this legislation, and I do hope that we can work together to get this to a posture to where everyone is supportive; but I do think it is important to refocus the fact that we are the ones who represent the majority of this economic driver, the majority of these jobs around the country, and they are the ones that represent these families that, for generations, have fished recreationally and that we want to ensure can fish for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the gentleman from Alaska for including our Modern Fish Act, which I think helps to update some practices where there is increased demand for recreational and commercial fisheries and providing a little bit better balance there.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this important bill. It moves our science and transparency and public participation in the right direction. It is going to improve the sustainability of our fisheries, the jobs associated with recreational and commercial fisheries, and the economic activity that these sustainable fisheries support.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while I certainly appreciate the size of the Louisiana and Alaska fisheries—and to some extent, I am jealous of some of the fishing opportunities that exist in those places. I have fished, myself, in Alaska, but Mr. GRAVES has yet to invite me to Louisiana for some fishing, and we hope to fix that going forward.

I don't want to leave the impression that the fishing industry and fishing communities in other parts of the country are not just as important. I also don't want to leave the impression that there is universal support for H.R. 200 even in Alaska and Louisiana. So we are going to have a little bit of a battle of the posters, Mr. Chairman.

This is a partial listing of the groups that oppose H.R. 200 in its current form. They oppose it for the reasons that I have mentioned. They consider it irresponsible to undermine the science-based catch limits and rebuilding framework that have been so critical to the success of this bill going forward, and they don't want to see us backslide into the era of loose regulations and overfishing that will inevitably follow. They have seen this movie before, and they know what happens when we undermine core conservation provisions.

So among the many groups and organizations listed in opposition, we certainly have the Alaska Long Line Fishermen's Association, over here, the Gulf Fishermen's Association, and the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders

Alliance, among many, many others in opposition to H.R. 200.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 200, which, unfortunately, I believe, joining my colleagues, would undermine our ability to responsibly manage our fisheries and would ultimately harm our fishing industry in the United States.

Because of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and diligent science-based fisheries management, the United States is viewed as an international leader in the industry.

In my district, since 2000, more than 40 overfished stocks have bounced back not by luck, Mr. Chairman, but because of commonsense regulations that were put in place by the MSA.

The industry has put an emphasis on setting catch limits and rehabilitating these stocks to ensure that the industry can continue to thrive for generations to come. Since 2010, when just 28 of those 40 stocks had been rebuilt, we saw a 54 percent increase in commercial gross revenues, which is income that goes directly back into our communities.

In 2015, commercial fishing in my home State of Washington brought in \$1.7 billion, which was lower than some previous years because of those very ongoing overfishing challenges in our oceans, especially in the Pacific Northwest. These rollbacks that are proposed in this bill would make things worse.

Locally, we are focused on increasing revenues by maintaining healthy stocks and healthy oceans. We can grow opportunities for future generations while also protecting our environment and strengthening our economy.

I am so proud to be from the State of Washington, the State that elected Warren Magnuson to this body, and of the fact that the Magnuson-Stevens Act has demonstrated broad bipartisan support as well as support, as my colleagues said, from the fishing industry, environmentalists, scientists, chefs, and business owners. It is our responsibility, Mr. Chairman, to continue to build on those successes, and we can do that today by voting "no" on H.R. 200.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, the dean of the House, for his efforts on this.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

As chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus and an avid recreational angler, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan effort to provide much-needed reform to our Nation's fisheries management.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the speakers that have gone before me on the

other side of the aisle if any of them fish or are they a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. Have they taken the opportunity to educate themselves on the fishery issues that we are facing today?

Generations of folks have enjoyed one of America's greatest pastimes in our coastal waters. Unfortunately, antiquated Federal policies have unnecessarily limited the public's access to abundant marine fisheries.

Commercial and recreational fishing are different activities that require different management strategies. The Magnuson-Stevens Act has lacked the tools necessary to address the needs of recreational fisheries management. H.R. 200 provides an opportunity to recognize the alternative management approach in the Nation's principal fisheries law to the benefit of 11 million saltwater anglers.

Despite what some have said, H.R. 200 does not roll back conservation but, instead, provides Federal fishery managers with the tools to effectively manage both recreational and commercial fisheries. It provides for 21st century technologies to guide fishery management decisions that will further ensure that our marine resources are managed for abundance, long-term sustainability, and to the greatest benefit of the Nation.

As a recreational angler for my entire life, I understand the critical role that we play in conservation resource management. In 2016, anglers and boaters contributed \$628 million in excise taxes for sport fish conservation and management, boating safety, infrastructure, and habitat restoration. In addition to that, anglers contributed \$693 million through fish and license fees.

This bill will continue to ensure the conservation of our marine fisheries and will restore the public's trust in fisheries management.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to respectfully push back on the idea that you have to be a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus to have standing in this debate.

The fact is, and we have shared some of the groups opposing this legislation, the opposition includes many recreational fishing interests, and opposing legislators include many of us who actually do spend a lot of time on the water catching fish. So let's dispel that notion.

Now, there are some in the recreational fishing sector who will argue that Magnuson is broken, that it does not work for them, because, as they explain, it requires recreational fisheries, just like other fisheries, to abide by overall catch limits that are based on science. In other words, the law doesn't work because they don't want to have to stop fishing when their catch reaches unsustainable levels. That is a situation not of a law that is broken. It

actually shows that we have a law that is playing a very, very important role.

Now, what would H.R. 200 do if it were enacted into law? It would enable recreational anglers to take more fish right now without regard for the future.

Proponents of the bill are advocating to increase recreational catch limits, reallocate catch away from commercial fishermen with mandated reallocation reviews, and water down the sustainable fishing mandates in current law.

□ 1530

That would mean taking more fish now, threatening fisheries with the risk of overfishing in the future, which we know, because we have seen this movie before, will lead to bans and closed fisheries in the future.

Managing fisheries sometimes requires tough choices. It shouldn't be about immediate gratification. And let's remember, the recreational fishermen are not disadvantaged under the current management system. In fact, in some regions, like the Gulf of Mexico, recreational fishers currently take home 70 percent of the Gulf's most popular fish. Recreational anglers land an overwhelming majority of species like amberjack, cobia, red drum, king mackerel, spotted sea trout, and triggerfish. And for the Gulf red snapper, the division of quota between the recreational and seafood sectors is a more balanced situation, roughly 50/50.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, they are promoting the opposition to this bill from interest groups that don't have any interest in commercial fishing, period. Let's be real about this.

What hurts me, I have heard them say that it removes science from fisheries. Let's explore this. No one is listening, but that is okay.

For starters, the words "science" and "data" appear 34 times throughout the bill. Section 207 directs the councils to establish a plan for cooperative research that brings together a wide variety of high-quality, non-Federal data to support existing data.

This is about States, coastal areas, villages, communities, fishermen making decisions instead of the Federal Government, and I know they don't like that.

Section 208 directs the Secretary to work with the States to find the best way to incorporate State data, just not their own data.

Section 301 directs the Secretary to develop a strategic plan for conducting stock assessments for every stock in a fishery's management plan.

Again, science.

Section 303 replaces an arbitrary 10-year rebuilding requirement. If the fish

come back quicker under this bill, H.R. 200, they could be fished at a sustainable yield level. Under the present law, which I wrote, they can't do that. Otherwise, we lose years and management of the fish for a period of time. That is up to the councils under H.R. 200.

Section 306 directs the Secretary to expedite approval of high-quality State data in the Gulf of Mexico to better advantage those recreational-heavy fisheries.

Finally, everything in this bill continues to be bound by the scientific principle of the Magnuson mandate to utilize the best available science for management decisions. There is nothing in this bill that weakens it, nothing. Yet I keep hearing the constant waves of dissension on the other side because they don't want to renew and make a better bill.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I again would like to talk about this legislation, the H.R. 200 bill. I am disappointed in the other side. It is a partisan issue, and, unfortunately, it is.

I was listening to the speakers on the other side, and they really don't have a concrete reason to object to this bill other than what they are being told by those who don't want commercial fishing, and they don't want recreational fishing. They may not say that, but in reality, that is really what they are seeking.

Now, I again go back to myself and the period of time when the 200-mile limit occurred. Why did it happen?

I was in Kodiak, Alaska. None of you were even born, probably, at that time. I was in Kodiak, Alaska, looked out 12 miles off the shore of Kodiak, and there was a wall of lights. I said: What is that?

This was before I was a Congressman.

He said: That is foreign fishermen catching our fish—catching our fish, America's fish.

When I got elected to Congress, one of the first things I did was try to develop the Magnuson-Stevens Act with Gerry Studts from Massachusetts. He was in the majority; I was the minority; and I explained to him what was happening.

He went back home to a fishing district and then said: You have got a good idea. Let's develop an economic zone 200 miles out, and we will control the fisheries in that area.

So we worked together bipartisanly, wrote a bill with a concrete suggestion for sustainable yield for fish, fishermen, communities for America, and for our coastal States that are involved in commercial fisheries and recreational fisheries.

We passed that bill, yes, out of the House, I believe, pretty much unanimously. Went to the Senate side, and the Senate sided with Magnuson-Stevens and decided to do the same thing.

Out of that, after we had opposition from just about every liberal in the business—for what reason, I don't know, other than they thought it would affect the international sea—it was finally signed into law by President Ford.

From there, we have gone to the best managed fisheries in the world. From there, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, we have been able to achieve what we should do. But we have grown in science. We have grown in more knowledge about how and where we should fish and when.

People talk about the species that were depleted. There were no species until this bill was established. And we rebuilt them, and we are still rebuilding them under our science under this bill. But it gives that flexibility to States to help manage.

Now, I know on that side of the aisle, they believe that the Federal Government can do everything—in fact, they should do everything because we don't know what we are doing. The States aren't really States, they are part of the Federal Government, instead of the other way around.

I argue that knowledge within States with science available and science under present law under this bill, which we do not extinguish, is really the crux of this issue, that the 200-mile limit, the H.R. 200 bill, my bill today—not because of me. I did not write this bill for myself. I wrote it for the communities, for the fish, and the fishermen for America.

Those that oppose it, I said: Uh-uh. They are not listening to the communities. They believe Big Government can do best for them and States should not be involved. I argue it is the States' issue to protect their fish, yes, with supervision of the Federal Government.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, of course I have great respect for my colleague from Alaska. In fact, in many ways, he deserves credit for helping craft the original Fishery Conservation and Management Act, for bringing to the Nation what could be considered the Alaska model of fisheries management through subsequent Magnuson Act reauthorizations. So I find myself, ironically, in the position of defending the framework that he essentially created against my colleagues' attempts to make changes that I believe are fundamentally threatening to that very framework.

It is this Alaska model that we support, complete with science-based catch limits, industry accountability for sustainable harvest, and the constant march towards sustainable practices. That is what has made U.S. fisheries, under the Magnuson Act, a model for the world, and that is what we are trying to continue.

Now, it has been suggested that rebuilding timeframes are too rigid and too restrictive. We will talk more about this when we get to some of the specific debate on amendments. But it is important to know that there is flexibility on rebuilding goals in the Magnuson Act and that flexibility is being used. It is also working. And a great example of that is what has happened with sea scallops under the Magnuson Act.

Fishery managers implemented a rebuilding plan for sea scallops in 1998. Within a couple of years, the fishery had been rebuilt, and now the scallop fishery is one of the country's most valuable fisheries.

In 1998, a little over 13 million pounds of scallop were landed. By 2016, that amount had tripled to 40 million pounds, resulting in more money in fishermen's pockets.

So there is a lot at stake with these issues, and we should bear in mind not only the numbers we talked about regarding the many jobs, the billions of dollars contributed to the economy from commercial and recreational fishing, but the potential to do even more and to do even better if we manage our fisheries carefully.

NOAA has estimated that rebuilding all U.S. fish stocks would generate an additional \$31 billion in seafood sales, support an additional 500,000 jobs, and increase the revenue that fishermen receive at the dock by \$2.2 billion. That is why we want to keep these critical provisions that have worked so well, because we can do even better if we stay the course.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman YOUNG for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said during this debate that recreational fishermen aren't being disadvantaged under the current system. Our fishermen, both commercial and recreational, are absolutely being disadvantaged, and that is exactly why we must pass this bill. I will give you one example.

If you are a commercial fisherman in New York, you could catch 50 pounds of fluke once per day for 7 days. You have to go out. You can catch 50 pounds. That is 350 pounds for the week.

Now, it would make more sense if we were able to have a system in place where they were catching 350 pounds maybe in 1 day, like maybe New Jersey, where you could do 500 pounds for 3 days.

Or if we want to talk about the science where you have black sea bass, 240 percent over the target biomass, yet we are seeing a quota reduction, compared to other States, in New York. Our fishermen are getting disadvantaged under the current system.

Or the NOAA observer program, where you have a fisherman who is

taking someone out to go to an area where they know there is not going to be any fish and they end up collecting flawed data that is sitting on a shelf and not even ending up getting used.

The reality right now is that we have fishermen in my district who are desperate to survive 365 days of the year, from early in the morning until late at night, barely making ends meet, on a boat that barely works, with overhead where they are having trouble being able to pay their own bills to get by. They are looking for people to fight for them in this Chamber, to fight for that business owner, to fight for them so that they can make ends meet.

It is about protecting the fishery as those very fishermen care so much about. But they know that the system could get better, and that is why we are here, fighting for them. That is why I thank DON YOUNG for his leadership, because they are watching right now on C-SPAN.

In my district, those fishermen are watching on the internet, they are watching on TV, and they are looking for people to fight for them because they have been struggling for years and decades, and they are desperate to get this passed so that they can afford to pay their bills, so that when they are going out at 3 a.m. tomorrow and they are going to come back late at night, that they know that things are going in the right direction, that their government is going to start working for them at the Federal level, the State level, the regional level, we are doing our part.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my longtime friend, Congressman YOUNG, our dean of the House, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 200, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. This bipartisan bill reauthorizes one of the most successful conservation programs in Magnuson-Stevens in a way that recognizes many of the successes of the program.

Magnuson-Stevens was established in 1976 with one primary goal: to reduce overfishing. With a successful update in the 1990s and 2000s, we have now met many of the goals the program was established to meet.

Compared to when the law was established, 84 percent of the stocks are no longer overfished, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Yet we still treat many of these healthy fish stocks as if nothing has changed.

I am an avid sportsman. I have hunted and fished with both my son and my grandchildren. There is no one who

cares more about conservation and protection of endangered species than hunters and recreational fishers. It is time that Magnuson-Stevens reflects a healthy balance between commercial and recreational fishermen.

All too often, recreational fishers take a backseat to the commercial interests. This bill recognizes the unique space that recreational anglers occupy and gives them the certainty they need to enjoy our natural resources.

□ 1545

Saltwater anglers contribute \$70 billion annually to the Nation's economy and support jobs all over the country, and there is no one who cares more about the health of our oceans either. In 2016, anglers, through excise taxes, contributed \$628 million in support of conservation programs and resource management.

This bill will set catch limits in 3-year time periods to give anglers certainty so they know when to plan trips. All too often, arbitrary changes to seasons have caused problems up and down the Gulf Coast of Texas.

This bill recognizes that technology has advanced in many ways in measuring the health of our fish stocks. State agencies, universities, and local conservation groups have come with up with many innovative ways to measure the health of fish stocks. I am glad that this bill includes language that I worked on to make sure that we had the most scientifically accurate data possible when it comes to determining the number of certain stocks.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to be a cosponsor to this bill and urge all of my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman from Alaska for the time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we certainly support recreational fishing. I do. I have a lot of it in my district, and that is one of the reasons why, as I worked with Mr. YOUNG to try to achieve a bipartisan reauthorization bill, we were willing to accept many of the provisions regarding recreational fishing. But you don't help recreational anglers when you go too far in relaxing annual catch limits or when you go too far in rolling back the rebuilding framework. Because when these fisheries crash, as inevitably they will, it is not just commercial fishing boats that are going to be out of the water. Everyone suffers. These fisheries will be closed.

And that is why so many recreational fishing interest groups and individuals have weighed in in opposition to H.R. 200. They have concluded, as we have, that the short-term gratification for some is not worth the long-term damage to all.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Alaska has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the full committee who allowed me to bring this outstanding bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, this bill is the result of more than 6 years of work with commercial and recreational fishing groups, the seafood industry, coastal communities, and both sides of the aisle. It is a bipartisan bill that codifies the Obama-era guidelines and provides flexibility for fishery managers.

It is a good bill, but I do want to address some of the inconsistencies that have been circulated by Members or NGOs. At least let me hit some of the most gross inaccuracies. In dissenting views, it was written that:

Don Young agreed to work with Democratic Members and the staff to develop a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, Chairman Bishop pulled the plug on promising negotiations and rushed to markup with a half-baked mash-up of bad ideas.

This bill was a year in negotiation. Our efforts of trying to put numerous provisions on the table and accepting additional Democratic provisions were simply labeled as nonstarters. Every time Mr. YOUNG agreed to a change, another issue came up. It is a perfect example of Lucy pulling the ball out from under Charlie Brown. Mr. YOUNG is Charlie Brown.

Mr. Chair, I am appreciative, though, of certain off-committee Democrats who jumped at the opportunity to compromise. I especially want to thank Mr. VEASEY and Mr. GREEN for their willingness to work across the aisle and assist with cosponsoring this particular bill.

Opponents of this bill said there is no science; that it is being taken out of the management decisions. Science and data appear 34 times throughout the bill. Sections 207, 208, 301, 303, and 306, all require the Secretary to use science, which means, if Mr. YOUNG were trying to remove science from his bill and the process, he really did a crappy job at it.

This bill is also coming with the old canard that we are going to start overfishing. There is nothing in this bill that removes basic requirements that prevent overfishing, and it is consistent with guidelines for fishery management that were put forth in the Obama administration.

Another dissenting point that was made says that this bill is nothing more than a partisan measure. It is a cute idea, but something that is simply not there. Letters from scientists, many of them—in fact, most of them—do not conduct the type of research that underpins fisheries management. All have said that all of these agencies, the ESA, NEPA, and the Antiquities Act, whatever, are going to be destroyed because of this bill.

There was one specifically from the Seafood Harvesters of America that was brought to my attention because

in that particular letter that was dated in June of this year, the group claimed that section 12 repealed sections of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. That is really cute because there is no section 12 in this act.

Section 12 hasn't been a part of this bill since November of 2017. In the opposition letters to this particular bill, there have always been references to previous versions of the bill, or they failed to recognize significant changes that were added, compromises that were added by both Mr. YOUNG and Mr. GRAVES in their manager's amendment.

The kind of rhetoric that is opposed to this particular bill that we are seeing, in the past from NGOs, embodies what is wrong with Washington. I hope that everyone can see these kind of glaring inaccuracies.

I am proud to support this bill. This bill does provide science. This bill does go through the process. This bill does move us forward. This bill does help commercial fishing and recreational fishing and the communities that are involved there. It is a good step forward. It has been 6 years in the coming. It has been 1 year of heavy work right now. It needs to go forward.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity of speaking and supporting this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, while we have some differences in the two sides, I don't believe that I have been injecting hyperpartisan rhetoric in this debate. Our differences, as I have emphasized multiple times, are about policy. This is not about which party we are on. In fact, it used to be very bipartisan, that this Congress would defend science-based catch limits and rigorous rebuilding timeframes because we all knew that those were very, very important provisions for sustainable fisheries, whether you were a Democrat or a Republican.

Now, if there is some group out there who has written a letter that refers to the wrong section, or includes inflammatory rhetoric because they feel like they were kept out of the loop as this bill developed, maybe that is an indication that they were kept out of the loop as this bill developed. And maybe that should have been considered along with the pile of letters that have come into my office and into other offices expressing fierce opposition to some of these irresponsible changes being proposed in this Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization.

Rather than disparage the stakeholders who are opposing this bill, I think we should listen to them.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a list of supporters of this legislation.

MAGNUSON-STEVENS REAUTHORIZATION
COALITION (115TH-H.R. 200)

Letters of Support
ORGANIZATION

State of Florida; State of Mississippi; AFTCO Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Banks, Inc.; Alliance Sports Group; Bass Pro Shops; American Fishing Wire/Hi-Seas; Beach Marine Products; American Tackle Company; Big Rock Sports, LLC; Anglers Journal TV; Billfish Inc.; Anglers Resource, LLC; Bluefin USA; B.A.S.S., LLC; Bob Sands Fishing Tackle; Bonnier Corporation; Brunswick Boat Group; Classic Fishing Products, Inc.; Bullet Weights, Inc.

Compass 360; Cabin Creek Bait Company; Composites One; Calderone & Associates; Crappie USA, Inc.; Capt. Harry's Fishing Supply; Crook & Crook, Inc.; Careco Multimedia Entertainment LLC; Dave's Bait, Tackle & Taxidermy; Catalyst Marketing Services; DL Ventures, LLC; CB's Saltwater Outfitters; Do-It Corporation; Chris Craft; Marine Division—Americas' Dometic Corporation; Don Coffey Company; FLW, LLC; Eposeidon Outdoor Adventures, Inc.; Forest River Inc.; Etic USA; Formula Boats.

F.J. Neil Company, Inc.; G-Rods International; Faria/Beede Instruments; G5 Products LLC; FISH307, LLC; GEM Products, Inc.; Fishidy, Inc.; Grady-White Boats; Fishunt Essentials, LLC; Hook & Gaff Watch Company; Fluid Motion LLC; Hook & Tackle Outfitters; iAngler Tournament Systems, LLC; Magic Tilt Trailers, Inc.; IMTRA Corporation; Malin Company; INDMAR Products; Marble, LLC; Jay's Sporting Goods; Marine Accessories Corporation; Jones & Company.

Maui Jim Sunglasses; Kureha America, LLC/Seaguar; Maverick Boat Group; L & S Bait Company; Maxima USA; Lew's Fishing Tackle; MCBC Holding Inc.; Lucas Oil Products Inc.; Mercury Marine; Millers Boating Center, Inc.; Pitman Creek Wholesale; Mud Hole Custom Tackle; PRADCO-Fishing; NauticStar Boats; Pro-Troll Fishing Products; Northland Fishing Tackle, LLC; ProNav Marine; On The Water Media Group; Rapala; Outdoor Pro Shop, Inc.; Realtree Active.

Outdoor.media; Red Drum Tackle Shop, Inc.; OutdoorFlics Digital Studios + Media Lab; Robalo Boats; Pacific Catch; Rockfish Sports; Rod-N-Bobb's, Inc.; Southeastern Fishing Tackle Liquidators; Rogers Sports Marketing; Southwick Associates, Inc.; Rome Speciality Company, Inc.; Sport Outdoors TV; Rudow's FishTalk Magazine; Sportco Marketing, Inc.; Seasonal Marketing, Inc.; Sportsman Boats Manufacturing, Inc.; SeaStar Solutions; Springfield Marine; Shimano North American Holding, Inc.; St. Croix Rods.

Skeeter Boats; Stealth Products, LLC; Smoker Craft, Inc.; SteelShad Fishing Company; Strike King Lure Company; Throw Raft LLC; Syntec Industries LLC; Tim Bailey & Associates; T-H Marine Supplies, Inc.; Tom Posey Company; Tackle Warehouse; Top Brass Tackle; Temple Fork Outfitters; Trik Fish LLC; The Fisherman Magazine; TTI-Blackmore Fishing Group; The Hammond Group; Uncle Josh Bait Company; Thomas F. Gowen & Sons; Vapor Apparel.

Thomas Spinning Lures, Inc.; Vectorply Corporation; Water Gremlin Company; ZEBCO Brands; Water Sports Industry Association; Zee Bait Co.; What The Fin Apparel & Purple Tuna Tees Inc.; White River Marine Group; Wholesale Buying Group; Wright & McGill Co.; Yakima Bait Company; Yamaha Marine Group; Z-Man Fishing Products, Inc.; American Scallop Association; Atlantic Red Crab Company; Atlantic Capes Fisheries; BASE Seafood; California Wetfish Producers Association; Cape Seafood.

Garden State Seafood Association; Inlet Seafood; Long Island Commercial Fishing Association; Lunds Fisheries, Inc.; North Carolina Fishers Association; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Alliance; Seafreeze Ltd.; Town Dock; West Coast Seafood Processors Association; Western Fishboat Owners Association; Freezer Longline Coalition; Florida Keys Commercial Fishing Association; Gulf Coast Seafood Alliance; Southeastern Fisheries Association.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we have some very critical differences of opinion on whether this bill is a good idea after years of success in rebuilding depleted fish stocks, after all of the economic value that we have created by allowing commercial and recreational fishing to resume in places all over this country, where at one time it was shut down because we failed to properly manage our fisheries.

We think, fundamentally, it is a bad idea at this point to declare mission accomplished and start rolling back the very bedrock provisions that have enabled us to achieve this success. It is with that in mind that I request Members to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman. I have no more speakers, and I am going to close by saying this is good legislation. We may have differences of opinion. It should be done. I am quite proud of the original act. I am proud of this act, too. Because I believe in the fisheries, not only commercial, and recreational, but sustainable; sustainable for the communities, the fish, and everybody in America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 200

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.*
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.*
- Sec. 3. Definitions.*
- Sec. 4. References.*

TITLE I—MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT FINDINGS AND DEFINITIONS AMENDMENTS AND REAUTHORIZATION

- Sec. 101. Amendments to findings.*
- Sec. 102. Amendments to definitions.*
- Sec. 103. Authorization of appropriations.*

TITLE II—FISHERIES MANAGEMENT FLEXIBILITY AND MODERNIZATION

- Sec. 201. Definitions.*
- Sec. 202. Process for allocation review for South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mixed-use fisheries.*
- Sec. 203. Alternative fishery management measures.*
- Sec. 204. Modifications to the annual catch limit requirement.*
- Sec. 205. Limitation on future catch share programs.*
- Sec. 206. Study of limited access privilege programs for mixed-use fisheries.*
- Sec. 207. Cooperative data collection.*
- Sec. 208. Recreational fishing data.*
- Sec. 209. Miscellaneous amendments relating to fishery management councils.*

TITLE III—HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE

- Sec. 301. Healthy fisheries through better science.*
- Sec. 302. Transparency and public process.*
- Sec. 303. Flexibility in rebuilding fish stocks.*
- Sec. 304. Exempted fishing permits.*
- Sec. 305. Cooperative research and management program.*
- Sec. 306. Gulf of Mexico fisheries cooperative research and red snapper management.*
- Sec. 307. Ensuring consistent management for fisheries throughout their range.*

TITLE IV—STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES

- Sec. 401. Estimation of cost of recovery from fishery resource disaster.*
- Sec. 402. Deadline for action on request by Governor for determination regarding fishery resource disaster.*
- Sec. 403. North Pacific Fishery management clarification.*
- Sec. 404. Limitation on harvest in North Pacific directed pollock fishery.*
- Sec. 405. Arctic community development quota.*
- Sec. 406. Reallocation of certain unused harvest allocation.*
- Sec. 407. Prohibition on shark feeding off coast of Florida.*
- Sec. 408. Restoration of historically freshwater environment.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, any term used that is defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802) shall have the same meaning such term has under that section.

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT FINDINGS AND DEFINITIONS AMENDMENTS AND REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS TO FINDINGS.

- Section 2(a) (16 U.S.C. 1801) is amended—*
 - (1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "cultural well-being," after "economy,"; and*
 - (2) in paragraph (10), by inserting "and traditional ways of life" after "economic growth".*

SEC. 102. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

- (a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—*
 - (1) in paragraph (2), by striking "management program";*
 - (2) in paragraph (34), by striking "The terms 'overfishing' and 'overfished' mean" and inserting "The term 'overfishing' means"; and*

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(43a) The term ‘depleted’ means, with respect to a stock of fish or stock complex, that the stock or stock complex has a biomass that has declined below a level that jeopardizes the capacity of the stock or stock complex to produce maximum sustainable yield on a continuing basis.”; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (43) the following:

“(43a)(A) The term ‘subsistence fishing’ means fishing in which the fish harvested are intended for customary and traditional uses, including for direct personal or family consumption as food or clothing; for the making or selling of handicraft articles out of nonedible byproducts taken for personal or family consumption, for barter, or sharing for personal or family consumption; and for customary exchange or trade.

“(B) In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘family’ means all persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption, or any person living within the household on a permanent basis; and

“(ii) the term ‘barter’ means the exchange of a fish or fish part—

“(I) for another fish or fish part; or

“(II) for other food or for nonedible items other than money if the exchange is of a limited and noncommercial nature.”.

(b) **SUBSTITUTION OF TERM.**—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the heading of section 304(e), by striking “OVERFISHED” and inserting “DEPLETED”; and

(2) by striking “overfished” each place it appears and inserting “depleted”.

(c) **CLARITY IN ANNUAL REPORT.**—Section 304(e)(1) (16 U.S.C. (e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The report shall distinguish between fisheries that are depleted (or approaching that condition) as a result of fishing and fisheries that are depleted (or approaching that condition) as a result of factors other than fishing. The report shall state, for each fishery identified as depleted or approaching that condition, whether the fishery is the target of directed fishing.”.

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 4 (16 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by striking “this Act” and all that follows through “(7)” and inserting “this Act”; and

(2) by striking “fiscal year 2013” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

TITLE II—FISHERIES MANAGEMENT FLEXIBILITY AND MODERNIZATION

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of implementing this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) **LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAM.**—The term “limited access privilege program” means a program that meets the requirements of section 303A of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a).

(3) **MIXED-USE FISHERY.**—The term “mixed-used fishery” means a Federal fishery in which two or more of the following occur:

(A) Recreational fishing.

(B) Charter fishing.

(C) Commercial fishing.

SEC. 202. PROCESS FOR ALLOCATION REVIEW FOR SOUTH ATLANTIC AND GULF OF MEXICO MIXED-USE FISHERIES.

(a) **STUDY OF ALLOCATIONS IN MIXED-USE FISHERIES.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall seek to enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mixed-use fisheries—

(1) to provide guidance to each applicable Council on criteria that could be used for allocating fishing privileges, including consideration of the conservation and socioeconomic benefits of the commercial, recreational, and charter components of a fishery, in the preparation of a fishery management plan;

(2) to identify sources of information that could reasonably support the use of such criteria in allocation decisions;

(3) to develop procedures for allocation reviews and potential adjustments in allocations; and

(4) that shall consider the ecological, economic and social factors relevant to each component of the mixed-use fishery including but not limited to: fairness and equitability of all current allocations; percent utilization of available allocations by each component; consumer and public access to the resource; and the application of economic models for fully estimating the direct and indirect value-added contributions of the various commercial and recreational fishing industry market sectors throughout chain of custody.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date an arrangement is entered into under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study conducted under that subsection.

(c) **PROCESS FOR ALLOCATION REVIEW AND ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, an applicable Council shall perform a review of the allocations to the commercial fishing sector and the recreational fishing sector of all applicable fisheries in its jurisdiction.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In conducting a review under paragraph (1), an applicable Council shall consider, in each allocation decision, the conservation and socioeconomic benefits of—

(A) the commercial fishing sector; and

(B) the recreational fishing sector.

(d) **DEFINITION OF APPLICABLE COUNCIL.**—In this section, the term “applicable Council” means—

(1) the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council; or

(2) the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

SEC. 203. ALTERNATIVE FISHERY MANAGEMENT MEASURES.

Section 302(h) (16 U.S.C. 1852(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)(C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7), the following:

“(8) have the authority to use alternative fishery management measures in a recreational fishery (or the recreational component of a mixed-use fishery), including extraction rates, fishing mortality targets, and harvest control rules, in developing a fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulations; and”.

SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS TO THE ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT.

(a) **REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS.**—Section 302 (16 U.S.C. 1852) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) **CONSIDERATIONS FOR MODIFICATIONS TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN DATA-POOR FISHERIES.**—Notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), in the case of a stock of fish for which the total annual catch limit is 25 percent or more below the overfishing limit, a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment have not been performed during the preceding 5 fishing years, and the stock is not subject to overfishing, a Council may, after notifying the Secretary, maintain the current annual catch

limit for the stock until a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment are conducted and the results are considered by the Council and its scientific and statistical committee.

“(2) **CONSIDERATION OF ECOSYSTEM AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS.**—In establishing annual catch limits a Council may, consistent with subsection (h)(6), consider changes in an ecosystem and the economic needs of the fishing communities.

“(3) **LIMITATIONS TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIAL FISHERIES.**—Notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), a Council is not required to develop an annual catch limit for—

“(A) an ecosystem-component species;

“(B) a fishery for a species that has a life cycle of approximately 1 year, unless the Secretary has determined the fishery is subject to overfishing; or

“(C) a stock for which—

“(i) more than half of a single-year class will complete their life cycle in less than 18 months; and

“(ii) fishing mortality will have little impact on the stock.

“(4) **RELATIONSHIP TO INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EFFORTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each annual catch limit, consistent with subsection (h)(6)—

“(i) may take into account management measures under international agreements in which the United States participates; and

“(ii) in the case of an annual catch limit developed by a Council for a species, shall take into account fishing for the species outside the exclusive economic zone and the life-history characteristics of the species that are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Council.

“(B) **EXCEPTION TO ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT.**—If fishery management activities by another country with respect to fishing outside the exclusive economic zone may hinder conservation efforts by United States fishermen for a fish species for which any of the recruitment, distribution, life history, or fishing activities are transboundary, and for which there is no informal transboundary agreement with that country in effect, then—

“(i) notwithstanding subsection (h)(6), no annual catch limit is required to be developed for the species by a Council; and

“(ii) if an annual catch limit is developed by a Council for the species, the catch limit shall take into account fishing for the species outside the exclusive economic zone that is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Council.

“(5) **AUTHORIZATION FOR MULTISPECIES COMPLEXES AND MULTIYEAR ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS.**—For purposes of subsection (h)(6), a Council may establish—

“(A) an annual catch limit for a stock complex; or including

“(B) annual catch limits for each year in any continuous period that is not more than three years in duration.

“(6) **ECOSYSTEM-COMPONENT SPECIES DEFINED.**—In this subsection the term ‘ecosystem-component species’ means a stock of fish that is a nontarget, incidentally harvested stock of fish in a fishery, or a nontarget, incidentally harvested stock of fish that a Council or the Secretary has determined—

“(A) is not subject to overfishing, approaching a depleted condition or depleted; and

“(B) is not likely to become subject to overfishing or depleted in the absence of conservation and management measures.

“(7) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as providing an exemption from the requirements of section 301(a) of this Act.”.

(b) **ACTION BY THE SECRETARY.**—Section 304 (16 U.S.C. 1854) is amended—

(1) by striking “(i) INTERNATIONAL OVERFISHING.” and inserting “(j) INTERNATIONAL OVERFISHING.—”;

(2) in subsection (j)(1), as redesignated, by inserting “shall” before “immediately”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(k) STOCK SURVEYS AND ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date that the Secretary receives notice from a Council under section 302(m), the Secretary shall complete a peer-reviewed stock survey and stock assessment of the applicable stock of fish and transmit the results of the survey and assessment to the Council.”.

SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON FUTURE CATCH SHARE PROGRAMS.

(a) CATCH SHARE DEFINED.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(2a) The term ‘catch share’ means any fishery management program that allocates a specific percentage of the total allowable catch for a fishery, or a specific fishing area, to an individual, cooperative, community, processor, representative of a commercial sector, or regional fishery association established in accordance with section 303A(c)(4), or other entity.”.

(b) CATCH SHARE REFERENDUM PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303A(c)(6)(D) (16 U.S.C. 1853a(c)(6)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) CATCH SHARE REFERENDUM PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(i) The New England, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico Councils may not submit a fishery management plan or amendment that creates a catch share program for a fishery, and the Secretary may not approve or implement such a plan or amendment submitted by such a Council or a Secretarial plan or amendment under section 304(c) that creates such a program, unless the final program has been approved, in a referendum in accordance with this subparagraph, by a majority of the permit holders eligible to participate in the fishery. For multispecies permits in the Gulf of Mexico, any permit holder with landings from within the sector of the fishery being considered for the catch share program within the 5-year period preceding the date of the referendum and still active in fishing in the fishery shall be eligible to participate in such a referendum. If a catch share program is not approved by the requisite number of permit holders, it may be revised and submitted for approval in a subsequent referendum.

“(ii) The Secretary may, at the request of the New England Fishery Management Council, allow participation in such a referendum for a fishery under the Council’s authority, by fishing vessel crewmembers who derive a significant portion of their livelihood from such fishing.

“(iii) The Secretary shall conduct a referendum under this subparagraph, including notifying all permit holders eligible to participate in the referendum and making available to them—

“(I) a copy of the proposed program;

“(II) an estimate of the costs of the program, including costs to participants;

“(III) an estimate of the amount of fish or percentage of quota each permit holder would be allocated; and

“(IV) information concerning the schedule, procedures, and eligibility requirements for the referendum process.

“(iv) For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘permit holder eligible to participate’ only includes the holder of a permit for a fishery under which fishing has occurred in 3 of the 5 years preceding a referendum for the fishery, unless sickness, injury, or other unavoidable hardship prevented the permit holder from engaging in such fishing.

“(v) The Secretary may not implement any catch share program for any fishery managed exclusively by the Secretary unless first petitioned by a majority of those permit holders eligible to participate in the fishery.”.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not apply to a catch share program that is submitted to, or proposed by, the Secretary of Commerce before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Before conducting a referendum under the amendment made by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations implementing such amendment after providing an opportunity for submission by the public of comments on the regulations.

SEC. 206. STUDY OF LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS FOR MIXED-USE FISHERIES.

(a) STUDY ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall seek to enter into an arrangement under which the Ocean Studies Board of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine shall—

(1) study the use of limited access privilege programs in mixed-use fisheries, including—

(A) identifying any inequities caused by a limited access privilege program;

(B) recommending policies to address the inequities identified in subparagraph (A); and

(C) identifying and recommending the different factors and information a mixed-use fishery should consider when designing, establishing, or maintaining a limited access privilege program to mitigate any inequities identified in subparagraph (A); and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study under paragraph (1), including the recommendations under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(b) TEMPORARY MORATORIUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), there shall be a moratorium on the submission and approval of a limited access privilege program for a mixed-use fishery until the date that the report is submitted under subsection (a)(1)(B).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subject to paragraph (3), a Council may submit, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, for a mixed-use fishery that is managed under a limited access system, a limited access privilege program if such program was part of a pending fishery management plan or plan amendment before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANDATORY REVIEW.—A Council that approves a limited access privilege program under paragraph (2) shall, upon issuance of the report required under subparagraph (a), review and, to the extent practicable, revise the limited access privilege program to be consistent with the recommendations of the report or any subsequent statutory or regulatory requirements designed to implement the recommendations of the report.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect a limited access privilege program approved by the Secretary of Commerce before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 207. COOPERATIVE DATA COLLECTION.

(a) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop, in consultation with the science and statistical committees of the Councils established under section 302(g) and the Marine Fisheries Commissions, and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on facilitating greater incorporation of data, analysis, stock assessments, and surveys from State agencies and nongovernmental sources described in paragraph (2) into fisheries management decisions.

“(2) NONGOVERNMENTAL SOURCES.—Nongovernmental sources referred to in paragraph (1) include the following:

“(A) Fishermen.

“(B) Fishing communities.

“(C) Universities.

“(D) Research and philanthropic institutions.

“(3) CONTENT.—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

“(A) identify types of data and analysis, especially concerning recreational fishing, that can be reliably used for purposes of this Act as the basis for establishing conservation and management measures as required by section 303(a)(1), including setting standards for the collection and use of that data and analysis in stock assessments and surveys and for other purposes as determined by the Secretary;

“(B) provide specific recommendations for collecting data and performing analyses identified as necessary to reduce uncertainty in and improve the accuracy of future stock assessments, including whether such data and analysis could be provided by nongovernmental sources, including fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions;

“(C) consider the extent to which it is possible to establish a registry of persons collecting or submitting the data and performing the analyses identified under subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(D) consider the extent to which the acceptance and use of data and analyses identified in the report in fishery management decisions is practicable.”.

(b) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall develop and publish guidelines under the amendment made by paragraph (a) by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) NAS REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall take into consideration and, to the extent feasible, implement the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences in the report entitled “Review of the Marine Recreational Information Program (2017)”, including—

(1) prioritizing the evaluation of electronic data collection, including smartphone applications, electronic diaries for prospective data collection, and an Internet website option for panel members or for the public;

(2) evaluating whether the design of the Marine Recreational Information Program for the purposes of stock assessment and the determination of stock management reference points is compatible with the needs of in-season management of annual catch limits; and

(3) if the Marine Recreational Information Program is incompatible with the needs of in-season management of annual catch limits, determining an alternative method for in-season management.

SEC. 208. RECREATIONAL FISHING DATA.

Section 401(g) (16 U.S.C. 1881(g)) is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5), and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish partnerships with States to develop best practices for implementation of State programs established pursuant to paragraph (2).

“(B) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall develop guidance, in cooperation with the States, that details best practices for administering State programs pursuant to paragraph (2), and provide such guidance to the State.”.

SEC. 209. MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS RELATING TO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS.

(a) COUNCIL JURISDICTION FOR OVERLAPPING FISHERIES.—Section 302(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “18” and inserting “19”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end “and a liaison who is a member of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council to represent the interests of fisheries under the jurisdiction of such Council”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “21” and inserting “22”; and
 (B) by inserting before the period at the end “and a liaison who is a member of the New England Fishery Management Council to represent the interests of fisheries under the jurisdiction of such Council”.

(b) COUNCIL SEAT.—Section 302(b)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1852(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or recreational” and inserting “, recreational, or subsistence fishing”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), in the second sentence, by inserting “, and in the case of the Governor of Alaska with the subsistence fishing interests of the State,” after “interests of the State”.

(c) PURPOSE.—Section 2(b)(3) (16 U.S.C. 1801(b)(3)) is amended by striking “and recreational” and inserting “, recreational, and subsistence”.

(d) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERING RED SNAPPER KILLED DURING REMOVAL OF OIL RIGS.—Any red snapper that are killed during the removal of any offshore oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico shall not be considered in determining under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) whether the total allowable catch for red snapper has been reached.

(e) PROHIBITION ON CONSIDERING FISH SEIZED FROM FOREIGN FISHING.—Any fish that are seized from a foreign vessel engaged in illegal fishing activities in the exclusive economic zone shall not be considered in determining under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) the total allowable catch for that fishery.

TITLE III—HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE

SEC. 301. HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF STOCK ASSESSMENT.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802), as amended by section 102(a) of this Act, is further amended by redesignating the paragraphs after paragraph (42) in order as paragraphs (44) through (53), and by inserting after paragraph (42) the following:

“(43) The term ‘stock assessment’ means an evaluation of the past, present, and future status of a stock of fish, that includes—

“(A) a range of life history characteristics for such stock, including—

“(i) the geographical boundaries of such stock; and

“(ii) information on age, growth, natural mortality, sexual maturity and reproduction, feeding habits, and habitat preferences of such stock; and

“(B) fishing for the stock.”.

(b) STOCK ASSESSMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c), as amended by section 207(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) STOCK ASSESSMENT PLAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and publish in the Federal Register, on the same schedule as required for the strategic plan required under subsection (b) of this section, a plan to conduct stock assessments for all stocks of fish for which a fishery management plan is in effect under this Act.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The plan shall—

“(A) for each stock of fish for which a stock assessment has previously been conducted—

“(i) establish a schedule for updating the stock assessment that is reasonable given the biology and characteristics of the stock; and

“(ii) subject to the availability of appropriations, require completion of a new stock assessment, or an update of the most recent stock assessment—

“(I) every 5 years; or

“(II) within such other time period specified and justified by the Secretary in the plan;

“(B) for each stock of fish for which a stock assessment has not previously been conducted—

“(i) establish a schedule for conducting an initial stock assessment that is reasonable given the biology and characteristics of the stock; and

“(ii) subject to the availability of appropriations, require completion of the initial stock assessment within 3 years after the plan is published in the Federal Register unless another time period is specified and justified by the Secretary in the plan; and

“(C) identify data and analysis, especially concerning recreational fishing, that, if available, would reduce uncertainty in and improve the accuracy of future stock assessments, including whether such data and analysis could be provided by fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions, to the extent that use of such data would be consistent with the requirements in section 301(a)(2) to base conservation and management measures on the best scientific information available.

“(3) WAIVER OF STOCK ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii), a stock assessment is not required for a stock of fish in the plan if the Secretary determines that such a stock assessment is not necessary and justifies such determination in the Federal Register notice required by this subsection.”.

(2) DEADLINE.—Notwithstanding section 404(f)(1) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended by this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall issue the first stock assessment plan under such section by not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC PROCESS.

(a) ADVICE.—Section 302(g)(1)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1852(g)(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Each scientific and statistical committee shall develop such advice in a transparent manner and allow for public involvement in the process.”.

(b) MEETINGS.—Section 302(i)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1852(i)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) Each Council shall make available on the Internet Web site of the Council—

“(i) to the extent practicable, a Webcast, an audio recording, or a live broadcast of each meeting of the Council, and of the Council Coordination Committee established under subsection (I), that is not closed in accordance with paragraph (3); and

“(ii) audio, video (if the meeting was in person or by video conference), or a searchable audio or written transcript of each meeting of the Council and of the meetings of committees referred to in section (g)(1)(B) of the Council by not later than 30 days after the conclusion of the meeting.

“(H) The Secretary shall maintain and make available to the public an archive of Council and scientific and statistical committee meeting audios, videos, and transcripts made available under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (G).”.

(c) FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENTS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Section 303 (16 U.S.C. 1853) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (9) and redesignating paragraphs (10) through (15) as paragraphs (9) through (14), respectively; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENT.—

“(1) Any fishery management plan (or fishery management plan amendment) prepared by any Council or by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), or proposed regulations deemed necessary pursuant to subsection (c), shall include a fishery impact statement which shall assess, specify and analyze the likely effects and impact of the proposed action on the quality of the human environment.

“(2) The fishery impact statement shall describe—

“(A) a purpose of the proposed action;

“(B) the environmental impact of the proposed action;

“(C) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposed action be implemented;

“(D) a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action;

“(E) the relationship between short-term use of fishery resources and the enhancement of long-term productivity;

“(F) the cumulative conservation and management effects; and

“(G) economic, and social impacts of the proposed action on—

“(i) participants in the fisheries and fishing communities affected by the proposed action;

“(ii) participants in the fisheries conducted in adjacent areas under the authority of another Council, after consultation with such Council and representatives of those participants; and

“(iii) the safety of human life at sea, including whether and to what extent such measures may affect the safety of participants in the fishery.

“(3) A substantially complete fishery impact statement, which may be in draft form, shall be available not less than 14 days before the beginning of the meeting at which a Council makes its final decision on the proposal (for plans, plan amendments, or proposed regulations prepared by a Council pursuant to subsection (a) or (c)). Availability of this fishery impact statement will be announced by the methods used by the Council to disseminate public information and the public and relevant government agencies will be invited to comment on the fishery impact statement.

“(4) The completed fishery impact statement shall accompany the transmittal of a fishery management plan or plan amendment as specified in section 304(a), as well as the transmittal of proposed regulations as specified in section (b).

“(5) The Councils shall, subject to approval by the Secretary, establish criteria to determine actions or classes of action of minor significance regarding subparagraphs (A), (B), (D), (E), and (F) of paragraph (2), for which preparation of a fishery impact statement is unnecessary and categorically excluded from the requirements of this section, and the documentation required to establish the exclusion.

“(6) The Councils shall, subject to approval by the Secretary, prepare procedures for compliance with this section that provide for timely, clear, and concise analysis that is useful to decisionmakers and the public, reduce extraneous paperwork and effectively involve the public, including—

“(A) using Council meetings to determine the scope of issues to be addressed and identifying significant issues related to the proposed action;

“(B) integration of the fishery impact statement development process with preliminary and final Council decision making in a manner that provides opportunity for comment from the public and relevant government agencies prior to these decision points; and

“(C) providing scientific, technical, and legal advice at an early stage of the development of the fishery impact statement to ensure timely transmittal and Secretarial review of the proposed fishery management plan, plan amendment, or regulations to the Secretary.”.

(2) EVALUATION OF ADEQUACY.—Section 304(a)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1854(a)(2)) is amended by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(D) evaluate the adequacy of the accompanying fishery impact statement as basis for fully considering the environmental impacts of implementing the fishery management plan or plan amendment.”.

(3) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—Section 304(b) (16 U.S.C. 1854(b)) is amended by striking so much as precedes subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(b) REVIEW OF REGULATIONS.—

“(1) Upon transmittal by the Council to the Secretary of proposed regulations prepared under section 303(c), the Secretary shall immediately initiate an evaluation of the proposed regulations to determine whether they are consistent with the fishery management plan, plan amendment, this Act and other applicable law. The Secretary shall also immediately initiate an evaluation of the accompanying fishery impact statement as a basis for fully considering the environmental impacts of implementing the proposed regulations. Within 15 days of initiating such evaluation the Secretary shall make a determination and—”

(4) EFFECT ON TIME REQUIREMENTS.—Section 305(e) (16 U.S.C. 1855(e)) is amended by inserting “the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)” after “the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)”.

SEC. 303. FLEXIBILITY IN REBUILDING FISH STOCKS.

(a) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 304(e) (16 U.S.C. 1854(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “possible” and inserting “practicable”;

(B) by amending subparagraph (A)(ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) may not exceed the time the stock would be rebuilt without fishing occurring plus one mean generation, except in a case in which—

“(I) the biology of the stock of fish, other environmental conditions, or management measures under an international agreement in which the United States participates dictate otherwise;

“(II) the Secretary determines that the cause of the stock being depleted is outside the jurisdiction of the Council or the rebuilding program cannot be effective only by limiting fishing activities;

“(III) the Secretary determines that one or more components of a mixed-stock fishery is depleted but cannot be rebuilt within that timeframe without significant economic harm to the fishery, or cannot be rebuilt without causing another component of the mixed-stock fishery to approach a depleted status;

“(IV) the Secretary determines that recruitment, distribution, or life history of, or fishing activities for, the stock are affected by informal transboundary agreements under which management activities outside the exclusive economic zone by another country may hinder conservation and management efforts by United States fishermen; and

“(V) the Secretary determines that the stock has been affected by unusual events that make rebuilding within the specified time period improbable without significant economic harm to fishing communities;”;

(C) by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B), by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) take into account environmental condition including predator/prey relationships;”;

(D) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) (as so redesignated) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(E) specify a schedule for reviewing the rebuilding targets, evaluating environmental impacts on rebuilding progress, and evaluating progress being made toward reaching rebuilding targets.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) A fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulations may use alternative rebuilding strategies, including harvest control rules and fishing mortality-rate targets to the extent they are in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

“(9) A Council may terminate the application of paragraph (3) to a fishery if the Council’s scientific and statistical committee determines and the Secretary concurs that the original deter-

mination that the fishery was depleted was erroneous, either—

“(A) within the 2-year period beginning on the effective date a fishery management plan, plan amendment, or proposed regulation for a fishery under this subsection takes effect; or

“(B) within 90 days after the completion of the next stock assessment after such determination.”

(b) EMERGENCY REGULATIONS AND INTERIM MEASURES.—Section 305(c)(3)(B) (16 U.S.C. 1855(c)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “180 days after” and all that follows through “provided” and inserting “1 year after the date of publication, and may be extended by publication in the Federal Register for one additional period of not more than 1 year, if”.

SEC. 304. EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the approval and issuance of an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) direct a joint peer review of the application for the exempted fishing permit by the appropriate regional fisheries science center and State marine fisheries commission; and

(2) certify that the Council or Federal agency with jurisdiction over the affected fishery has determined that—

(A) the fishing activity to be conducted under the proposed exempted fishing permit would not negatively impact any management measures or conservation objectives included within existing fishery management plans or plan amendments;

(B) the social and economic impacts in both dollar amounts and loss of fishing opportunities on all participants in each sector of the fishery expected to occur as a result of the proposed exempted fishing permit would be minimal;

(C) the information that would be collected through the fishing activity to be conducted under the proposed exempted fishing permit will have a positive and direct impact on the conservation, assessment, or management of the fishery; and

(D) the Governor of each coastal State potentially impacted by the proposed exempted fishing permit, as determined by the Secretary, has been consulted on the fishing activity to be conducted.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—The Secretary may not issue an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation that—

(1) establishes a limited access system as defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802);

(2) is consistent with section 303A of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a); or

(3) establishes a catch share program as defined in section 206(a) of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except for subsection (b)(2), nothing in this section may be construed to affect an exempted fishing permit approved under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 305. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 318 (16 U.S.C. 1867) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “(1)” before the first sentence, and by adding at the end the following:

“(2) Within one year after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, and after consultation with the Councils, the Secretary shall publish a plan for implementing and conducting the program established in paragraph (1). Such plan shall identify and describe critical regional fishery management and research needs, possible projects that may address those needs, and estimated costs for such projects. The plan shall be revised and updated every 5 years, and updated plans shall in-

clude a brief description of projects that were funded in the prior 5-year period and the research and management needs that were addressed by those projects.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “FUNDING” and inserting “PRIORITIES”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “including” and all that follows and inserting the following: “including—

“(A) the use of fishing vessels or acoustic or other marine technology;

“(B) expanding the use of electronic catch reporting programs and technology; and

“(C) improving monitoring and observer coverage through the expanded use of electronic monitoring devices.”.

SEC. 306. GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) FEDERAL GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.—Section 407 (16 U.S.C. 1883) is amended by striking all after the section heading and inserting the following:

“(a) CERTIFICATION OF STATE SURVEYS.—

“(1) INCLUSION OF CERTIFIED STATE SURVEYS.—In establishing the acceptable biological catch and total allowable catch for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico, the Secretary shall include—

“(A) Gulf State recreational fisheries surveys that are certified under subsection (b); and

“(B) data related to red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico collected by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, nongovernmental organizations, and other nongovernmental sources, including universities and research institutions.

“(b) STATE SURVEYS.—

“(1) SUBMISSION.—A Gulf State that conducts a recreational fisheries survey in the Gulf of Mexico to make catch estimates for red snapper landed in such State may submit such survey to the Secretary for certification.

“(2) CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a certification or a denial of certification for any survey submitted under paragraph (1) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date the survey is submitted.

“(B) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A recreational fisheries survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of such period if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

“(3) MODIFICATION OF SURVEYS DENIED CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a survey of a Gulf State is denied certification under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the denial, provide the Gulf State a proposal for modifications to the survey.

“(B) PROPOSAL.—A proposal provided to a Gulf State for a survey under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall be specific to the survey submitted by such Gulf State and may not be construed to apply to any other Gulf State;

“(ii) shall require revision to the fewest possible provisions of the survey; and

“(iii) may not unduly burden the ability of such Gulf State to revise the survey.

“(C) MODIFIED SURVEY.—

“(i) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—If a survey of a Gulf State was denied certification under paragraph (2), the Gulf State may modify the survey and submit the modified survey to the Secretary for certification or denial of certification.

“(ii) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall make a certification or denial of certification for any modified survey not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the modified survey is submitted.

“(iii) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A modified survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the period described in clause (ii) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) **GULF STATE.**—The term ‘Gulf State’ means each of the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, or Florida.

“(2) **RED SNAPPER.**—The term ‘red snapper’ means the species *Lutjanus campechanus*.”

(b) **STOCK SURVEYS AND STOCK ASSESSMENTS.**—The Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Marine Fisheries Service Regional Administrator of the Southeast Regional Office, shall for purposes of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.)—

(1) develop a schedule of stock surveys and stock assessments for the Gulf of Mexico Region and the South Atlantic Region for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and for every 5-year period thereafter;

(2) direct the Southeast Science Center Director to implement such schedule; and

(3) in such development and implementation—
(A) give priority to those stocks that are commercially or recreationally important; and

(B) ensure that each such important stock is surveyed at least every 5 years.

(c) **USE OF FISHERIES INFORMATION IN STOCK ASSESSMENTS.**—The Southeast Science Center Director shall ensure that fisheries information made available through fisheries programs funded under Public Law 112–141 is incorporated as soon as possible into any fisheries stock assessments conducted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **STATE FISHERIES MANAGEMENT IN THE GULF OF MEXICO WITH RESPECT TO RED SNAPPER.**—Section 306(b) (16 U.S.C. 1856(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Notwithstanding section 3(11), for the purposes of managing the recreational sector of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery, the seaward boundary of a coastal State in the Gulf of Mexico is a line 9 miles seaward from the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured.”

SEC. 307. ENSURING CONSISTENT MANAGEMENT FOR FISHERIES THROUGHOUT THEIR RANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Act is amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

“SEC. 5. ENSURING CONSISTENT FISHERIES MANAGEMENT UNDER CERTAIN OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

“(a) **NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT AND ANTIQUITIES ACT OF.**—In any case of a conflict between this Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Antiquities Act of 1906 (54 U.S.C. 320301 et seq.), this Act shall control.

“(b) **FISHERIES RESTRICTIONS UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF.**—To ensure transparency and consistent management of fisheries throughout their range, any restriction on the management of fish in the exclusive economic zone that is necessary to implement a recovery plan under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be implemented—

“(1) using authority under this Act; and

“(2) in accordance with processes and time schedules required under this Act.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3 the following: “Sec. 4. Authorization of appropriations.

“Sec. 5. Ensuring consistent fisheries management under certain other Federal laws.”

TITLE IV—STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES

SEC. 401. ESTIMATION OF COST OF RECOVERY FROM FISHERY RESOURCE DISASTER.

Section 312(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1861a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(I)”;

(2) by redesignating existing subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, of subparagraph (A) (as designated by the amendment made by paragraph (1)); and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) The Secretary shall publish the estimated cost of recovery from a fishery resource disaster no later than 30 days after the Secretary makes the determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to such disaster.”

SEC. 402. DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST BY GOVERNOR FOR DETERMINATION REGARDING FISHERY RESOURCE DISASTER.

Section 312(a) (16 U.S.C. 1861a(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) The Secretary shall make a decision regarding a request from a Governor under paragraph (1) within 90 days after receiving an estimate of the economic impact of the fishery resource disaster from the entity requesting the relief.”

SEC. 403. NORTH PACIFIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT CLARIFICATION.

Section 306(a)(3)(C) (16 U.S.C. 1856(a)(3)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking “was no” and inserting “is no”; and

(2) by striking “on August 1, 1996”.

SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON HARVEST IN NORTH PACIFIC DIRECTED POLLOCK FISHERY.

Section 210(e)(1) of the American Fisheries Act (title II of division C of Public Law 105–277; 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) **HARVESTING.**—

“(A) **LIMITATION.**—No particular individual, corporation, or other entity may harvest, through a fishery cooperative or otherwise, a percentage of the pollock available to be harvested in the directed pollock fishery that exceeds the percentage established for purposes of this paragraph by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council.

“(B) **MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.**—The percentage established by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council shall not exceed 24 percent of the pollock available to be harvested in the directed pollock fishery.”

SEC. 405. ARCTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA.

Section 313 (16 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) **ARCTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA.**—If the North Pacific Fishery Management Council issues a fishery management plan for the exclusive economic zone in the Arctic Ocean, or an amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for Fish Resources of the Arctic Management Area issued by such Council, that makes available to commercial fishing, and establishes a sustainable harvest level, for any part of such zone, the Council shall set aside not less than 10 percent of the total allowable catch therein as a community development quota for coastal villages located north and east of the Bering Strait.”

SEC. 406. REALLOCATION OF CERTAIN UNUSED HARVEST ALLOCATION.

(a) **REALLOCATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective January 1, 2018, and thereafter annually, if the Regional Administrator receives receipt of written notice that the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), will not harvest some or all of the Aleutian Islands directed pollock, the Regional Administrator, as soon as practicable, shall—

(A) if the allocation as designated in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 does not exceed the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea subarea, reallocate the projected unused Aleutian Islands directed pollock to the Bering Sea subarea for harvest by the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004; or

(B) if the allocation exceeds the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea subarea, reallocate a portion of the allocation, up to the total allowable catch for the Bering Sea Subarea.

(2) The allocation shall be provided to the Aleut Corporation for the purposes of economic development in Adak, Alaska, pursuant to the requirement of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—For the purposes of this section:

(1) the allocation holder described in subsection (a) shall retain control of the allocation referenced in such subsection, including such portions of the allocation that may be reallocated pursuant to this section; and

(2) the allocations in section 206(b) of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note) apply to the Bering Sea portion of the directed pollock fishery and not to the allocation holder under section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004.

(c) **CONSENT REQUIREMENT.**—The Aleut Corporation will provide written consent for other vessels to take or process the allocation, a physical copy of which must be present on the vessel.

(d) **REVISION OF REGULATIONS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council, in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, shall modify all applicable regulations and management plans so that the allocation holder named in section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, may harvest the reallocated Aleutian Islands directed pollock fishery in the Bering Sea subarea as soon as practicable.

(2) **MANAGEMENT OF ALLOCATION.**—The National Marine Fisheries Service, in consultation with the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, shall manage the Aleutian Islands directed pollock fishery to ensure compliance with the implementing statute and with the annual harvest specifications.

(3) **ENFORCEMENT.**—Taking or processing any part of the allocation made by section 803 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004, and reallocated under this section without the consent required under subsection (c) shall be considered in violation of section 307 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) and subject to the penalties and sanctions under section 308 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1858), and any fish harvested or processed under such taking or possessing shall be subject to forfeiture.

SEC. 407. PROHIBITION ON SHARK FEEDING OFF COAST OF FLORIDA.

Section 307 (16 U.S.C. 1857) is amended—

(1) by striking “It is unlawful—” and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **PROHIBITION ON SHARK FEEDING OFF COAST OF FLORIDA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It is unlawful—

“(A) for any diver to engage in shark feeding in covered waters; and

“(B) for any person to operate a vessel for hire for the purpose of carrying a passenger to a site if such person knew or should have known that the passenger intended, at that site, to be a diver—

“(i) engaged in shark feeding in covered waters; or

“(ii) engaged in observing shark feeding in covered waters.

“(2) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection:

“(A) **COVERED WATERS.**—The term ‘covered waters’ means Federal waters off the coast of Florida.

“(B) **DIVER.**—The term ‘diver’ means a person who is wholly or partially submerged in covered water and is equipped with a face mask, face mask and snorkel, or underwater breathing apparatus.

“(C) **SHARK FEEDING.**—The term ‘shark feeding’ means—

“(i) the introduction of food or any other substance into covered water for the purpose of feeding or attracting sharks; or

“(ii) presenting food or any other substance to a shark for the purpose of feeding or attracting sharks.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply to shark feeding conducted—

“(A) by a research institution, university, or government agency for research purposes; or

“(B) for the purpose of harvesting sharks.”.

SEC. 408. RESTORATION OF HISTORICALLY FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENT.

Section 3(10) (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended by inserting “, except that such term shall not include any area previously covered by land or a fresh water environment in a State where the average annual land loss of such State during the 20 years before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act exceeds 10 square miles” after “maturity”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-786. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 17, strike lines 17 through 23 (and redesignate the subsequent quoted clauses).

Page 23, strike lines 20 through 23 and insert the following:

(b) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall make available on the Internet Website of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration the report required under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Beginning at page 31, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 36, line 25.

Beginning at page 40, line 17, strike section 304 and insert the following:

SEC. 304. EXEMPTED FISHING PERMITS.

(a) OBJECTIONS.—If the relevant Council, the Interstate Marine Fisheries Commission, or the fish and wildlife agency of an affected State objects to the approval and issuance of an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Regional Administrator of the National Marine Fisheries Service who issued such exempted fishing permit shall respond to such entity in writing detailing why such exempted fishing permit was issued.

(b) 12-MONTH FINDING.—At the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date the exempted fishing permit is issued under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, the Council that prepared the fishery management plan, or the Secretary in the case of a fishery management plan prepared and implemented by the Secretary, shall review the exempted fishing permit and determine whether any unintended negative impacts have occurred that would warrant the discontinuation of the permit.

(c) CLARIFICATION.—The Secretary may not issue an exempted fishing permit under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation that—

(1) establishes a limited access system as defined in section 3 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802);

(2) is consistent with section 303A of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1853a); or

(3) establishes a catch share program as defined in section 206(a) of this Act.

(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Except for subsection (b), nothing in this section may be construed to affect an exempted fishing permit approved under section 600.745 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

Beginning at page 44, line 1, strike section 306 and insert the following:

SEC. . . FEDERAL GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 407 (16 U.S.C. 1883) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 407. CERTIFICATION OF STATE SURVEYS.

“(a) SUBMISSION.—A Gulf State that conducts a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey in the Gulf of Mexico to make catch estimates for red snapper landed in such State may submit such survey to the Secretary for certification.

“(b) CERTIFICATION STANDARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, the Secretary shall establish and provide the Gulf States with standards for certifying State marine recreational fisheries statistical surveys that shall—

“(1) ensure that State marine recreational fisheries statistical surveys are appropriately pilot tested, independently peer reviewed, and endorsed for implementation by the reviewers;

“(2) use designs consistent with accepted survey sampling practices; and

“(3) minimize the potential for bias and known sources of survey error.

“(c) CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a certification or a denial of certification for any marine recreational fisheries statistical survey submitted under subsection (a) not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date that the survey and information needed to evaluate the survey under the standards established under subsection (b) are submitted.

“(2) TIMING.—In the case of a certification request from a Gulf State, the Secretary shall begin evaluation of the request upon receipt of all information necessary to make a determination consistent with the standards set forth under subsection (b).

“(3) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A marine recreational fisheries statistical survey shall be deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the 6-month period described in paragraph (1) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.

“(d) MODIFICATION OF SURVEYS DENIED CERTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey of a Gulf State is denied certification under subsection (c), the Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the denial, provide the Gulf State a proposal for modifications to the survey.

“(2) PROPOSAL.—A proposal provided to a Gulf State for a survey under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be specific to the survey submitted by such Gulf State and may not be construed to apply to any other Gulf State;

“(B) shall require revision to the fewest possible provisions of the survey; and

“(C) may not unduly burden the ability of such Gulf State to revise the survey.

“(3) MODIFIED SURVEY.—

“(A) AUTHORITY TO SUBMIT.—If a marine recreational fisheries statistical survey of a Gulf State was denied certification under subsection (c), the Gulf State may modify the survey and submit the modified survey to the Secretary for certification or denial of certification.

“(B) SCHEDULE.—The Secretary shall make a certification or denial of certification for any modified survey not later than the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date the modified survey is submitted.

“(C) DEEMED CERTIFIED.—A modified survey is deemed to be certified effective upon the expiration of the period described in subparagraph (B) if the Secretary has not made a certification or denial of certification.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section is amended by striking the item relating to section 407 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 407. Certification of State surveys.”.

Beginning at page 48, line 13, strike section 307.

Beginning at page 52, at line 8, strike section 406 and insert the following:

SEC. . . REALLOCATION OF CERTAIN UNUSED HARVEST ALLOCATION.

(a) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each year upon receipt by the Secretary of Commerce (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) of written notice from the allocation holder named in section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) that such holder will not harvest all or a part of the allocation authorized pursuant to that Act, the Secretary shall reallocate for that year the unused portion of such allocation to the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI (as defined in section 679.2 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations) and shall assign the reallocated unused portion of the allocation only to eligible vessels as described in subsection (b)(1) for harvest in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI, consistent with any agreements as described in subsection (c).

(b) ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE REALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Only vessels defined in subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) of section 208 of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), or any vessels authorized to replace such vessels, may receive a reallocation described in subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION ON REALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall not reallocate the allocation described in subsection (a) in any year if such reallocation exceeds the annual catch limit for pollock in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI.

(3) CALCULATIONS.—Any amount of the reallocation described in subsection (a) shall not be used in the calculation of harvesting or processing excessive shares as described in section 210(e) of the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note).

(4) CONDITIONS.—In any year, the assignment, transfer, or reallocation shall not violate the requirements of section 206(b) of the American Fisheries Act (title II of the division C of Public Law 105-277; 16 U.S.C. 1851 note).

(c) AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year, the allocation holder named in section 803(a) of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) may establish one or more agreements with the owners of some or all of the eligible vessels as defined in subsection (b)(1).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—Each agreement described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall specify those eligible vessels that may receive a reallocation and the amount

of reallocation that such vessels may receive in accordance with subsection (b)(2); and

(B) may contain other requirements or compensation agreed to by the allocation holder named in section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) and the owners of such eligible vessels, provided such requirements or compensation are otherwise consistent with the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), and any other applicable law.

(d) EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Except for the measures required by this section, nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council or the Secretary under the American Fisheries Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or other applicable law.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—Taking or processing any part of the allocation made by section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), and reallocated under this section in a manner that is not consistent with the reallocation authorized by the Secretary shall be considered in violation of section 307 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) and subject to the penalties and sanctions under section 308 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1858), and subject to the forfeiture of any fish harvested or processed.

(f) CLARIFICATIONS.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended by striking “during the years 2004 through 2008”.

(2) PURPOSE OF REALLOCATION.—Consistent with subsection (d) of section 803 of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199, 16 U.S.C. 1851 note), the reallocation of the unused portion of the allocation provided to the allocation holder named in subsection (a) of such section for harvest in the Bering Sea subarea of the BSAI is for the purposes of economic development in Adak, Alaska pursuant to the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

Page 55, after line 4, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. ____ COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT QUOTA PROGRAM PANEL VOTING PROCEDURES.

Section 305(i)(1)(G)(iv) (16 U.S.C. 1855(i)(1)(G)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

“(iv) VOTING REQUIREMENT.—The panel may act only by the affirmative vote of 5 of its members.”.

Beginning at page 57, line 1, strike section 408 and insert the following:

SEC. ____ RESTORATION OF HISTORICALLY FRESHWATER ENVIRONMENT.

Section 3(10) (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) by inserting a comma after “feeding”;

and

(2) by inserting the following: “except that such term—

“(A) does not include an area that—

“(i) was previously covered by land or a fresh water environment; and

“(ii) is in a State where the average annual land loss of such State during the 20 years before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act exceeds 10 square miles; and

“(B) does not apply with respect to a project undertaken by a State or local gov-

ernment with the purpose of restoration or protection of an area described in subparagraph (A).”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes a series of modifications in the underlying bill and removes specific provisions related to the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Antiquities Act, at the request of my Democrat cosponsors from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN and Mr. MARC VEASEY.

I introduced H.R. 200 in the early days of the 115th Congress. We have made many changes during the committee markup on H.R. 200. We adopted amendments authored by Ms. BORDALLO from Guam, as well as from the Senate Modern Fish Act that passed the Senate Committee on Commerce with an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

My manager’s amendment eliminated some provisions in the bill that were most troublesome to Democrats, even though many outside stakeholders and Members on my side of the aisle considered those to be important components of the bill. The further spirited bipartisan compromise and willingness to support a number of Democratic amendments today—despite the rhetoric coming from the committee Democrats—our actions, our markup, and our willingness to work with House Democrats show that we have, in fact, been willing to work in a bipartisan manner.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the manager’s amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1996, during floor debate passage of the bipartisan Sustainable Fisheries Act that amended and reauthorized Magnuson, the gentleman from Alaska said the following:

It is crucial that the management agencies within the Federal Government be proactive in protecting fisheries rather than attempting to address overfished stocks after they are in a crisis situation.

I couldn’t agree more, and it is true now, more than ever. Twenty-two years ago our fisheries were in shambles. Rampant overfishing had decimated stocks to the point of collapse and Congress needed to make some tough choices to ensure that there were fish left to catch in our oceans.

We made tough choices in 1996, and we made them in 2006, putting in place

requirements to end overfishing, to rebuild overfished stocks, and setting science-based annual catch limits. And because we did that, because we made those tough choices, the number of overfished stocks is at an all-time low. The number of rebuilt stocks is at an all-time high, and most stocks are trending in a positive direction that is benefiting fishermen in coastal communities.

I cannot support legislation that would turn our backs on what has worked so well, but H.R. 200, unfortunately, would take us in the wrong direction, back to the bad old days of fisheries management and taxpayer bailouts because we loosen the rules that prevent overfishing.

Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his many years of service in this Chamber, and I would note that those of us who were not here in 1996 are not so-called johnny-come-latelies, but we are simply younger than the gentleman. In fact, just about everyone in this House is younger than the gentleman, and I say that with great respect.

□ 1600

I have worked on fisheries issues throughout my time in this Chamber and, before that, for 6 years in the California Assembly. In my personal life, I have been fishing as long as I can remember. I have even pulled in set nets on a commercial boat in Cook Inlet in the gentleman’s district. So my years of interest in these issues is largely why I am so disappointed to be standing here debating a fisheries bill that is, unfortunately, too partisan.

My staff and I worked hard and in good faith to find a bipartisan compromise, and while the manager’s amendment does remove some of the most egregious language that would undermine environmental laws like the Endangered Species Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the American Antiquities Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act, the fact is those provisions never should have been in a Magnuson reauthorization bill in the first place. They were always nonstarters, and removing them does not fix the serious threat to fisheries posed by H.R. 200’s undermining of catch limits and rebuilding timeframes.

What is more, my staff and I did offer compromise language from Senator WICKER’s Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act. Even that language that every single Republican on the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee had supported in markup was rejected, unfortunately, by my colleagues across the aisle and did not find its way into the manager’s amendment.

We also offered on these points of disagreement for catch limits and rebuilding timeframes to simply leave existing law in place because it has been working, and that, too, was unacceptable, unfortunately, to our colleagues across the aisle. So what is left before

us in H.R. 200 would fundamentally gut provisions that have made Magnuson so successful.

Now is not the time to move away from catch limits based on sound science and toward catch limits based on wishful thinking. It is not the time to allow rebuilding of overstocked fish to be delayed indefinitely. We have seen this movie before, and we know what happens.

Mr. Chairman, the manager's amendment does remove some poison pill provisions that should never have been in the bill, but it does nothing to fix the wrongheaded rollbacks of catch limits and rebuilding timeframes that will inevitably lead us to overfishing. That is why this bill has been called the empty oceans act, and that is why it is opposed by so many stakeholders.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the dozens of letters we have received since the manager's amendment was introduced.

GULF OF MEXICO REEF FISH
SHAREHOLDERS' ALLIANCE,
July 5, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance (Shareholders' Alliance), I write to you today to express our continued strong opposition to H.R. 200, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act of 2017."

The Shareholders' Alliance is the largest organization of commercial snapper and grouper fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico, with membership in every Gulf state. We work hard to ensure that our fisheries are sustainably managed so our fishing businesses can thrive and our fishing communities can exist for future generations. We are the harvesters that provide much of the American public with a reliable source of domestically-caught wild Gulf seafood, and we do this through a philosophy that sustainable seafood and profitable fishing businesses depend on healthy fish populations.

It has come to our attention that the House plans to vote on H.R. 200 after Congress resumes from its July 4th recess. We must express our continued concerns with this harmful bill and we strongly encourage you to vote against it. It would significantly harm our nation's fishermen and women, seafood suppliers, and seafood consumers through punitive restrictions and requirements that would not improve recreational fishing. H.R. 200 would make several damaging changes to the bedrock principles of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

H.R. 200 would unnecessarily make it more difficult for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Gulf Council) to use limited access privilege programs (LAPPs) and catch shares as management tools. We believe that the decision-makers on the ground in the region should be able to make an informed decision as to whether LAPPs or catch shares may be appropriate for a fishery or not. Congress shouldn't tie the hands of the Gulf Council and preemptively remove these fishery management tools from the toolbox. Using these tools for commercial

and charter fishing sectors has no impact on how recreational fishing is managed.

Also, H.R. 200 would promote new limitations and exemptions to annual catch limits (ACLs). ACLs allow fishing at sustainable levels to maximize access while minimizing the risk of overfishing our shared fishery resources. Inherent in this management tool is the acknowledgement that exceeding science-based catch limits reduces future opportunities, and that this should be avoided. The existing generation of fishermen has already sacrificed to rebuild these fisheries—let's not burden the next generation with having to rebuild them again.

Additionally, proponents of H.R. 200 claim that the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not provide adequate flexibility and rigidly imposes a 10-year rebuilding timeframe for overfished fisheries. However, the Magnuson-Stevens Act already allows fishery managers to approve fishery rebuilding timelines greater than 10 years in length due to a range of biological, economic, or social factors. In fact, Gulf of Mexico red snapper—the resource that many of us have built our small businesses on—is already experiencing that flexibility as it is in Year 13 of the current 27 year rebuilding plan. If the red snapper stock rebuilds by 2032 as intended, the stock will have been under a rebuilding program for over 40 years.

Finally, H.R. 200 would overload the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council with allocation review requirements that would leave little time or funding to perform its primary function of managing Gulf fisheries (e.g., setting catch limits and fishing seasons, conducting stock assessments, habitat management, etc.).

Furthermore, some Amendments to H.R. 200 would simply make a bad bill even worse. Specifically, Amendment 26 would open the door to levying additional taxes on commercial fishermen, over and above the maximum amount they are legally required to pay today. We question why this punitive measure is directed only at two regions of the United States—the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic. Why are the other six regional fishery management councils exempted from this measure? Furthermore, Amendment 26 would initiate a process that could lead to eliminating the participation of commercial fishing, seafood industry, and charter fishing businessmen and women in regional fishery management councils. These purported "conflicts of interest" are a non-issue, as all regional fishery management councils already enact standard operating procedures to address this concern. Simply put, Amendment 26 is a direct assault on commercial fishermen in these two regions and would only serve to eliminate fishing expertise from regional fishery management councils in order to further the interests of recreational fishing organizations. This would be a disservice to the millions of Americans who only access American seafood through restaurants, fish markets, and grocery stores.

Our nation has set the gold standard for sustainable fisheries because of our commitment to science-based management under the 2007 Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization. The science-based conservation requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act helped support the development of the commercial individual fishing quota programs in the Gulf of Mexico have played crucial roles in nearly tripling the red snapper quota for all fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico over the last 10 years, from 5 million pounds to nearly 14 million pounds. Clearly, the Magnuson-Stevens Act is working.

The nation's fishermen, seafood suppliers, consumers, and Congressional leaders must protect the gains we have made under the

last 40 years of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. It is in everyone's best interests to pass vibrant national fishery resources on to the next generation. H.R. 200 would put that in jeopardy. H.R. 200 is widely opposed by the commercial fishing industry throughout the United States (especially in the state of Florida), as well as by the seafood industry, the restaurant industry, the charter fishing industry, and others who depend on healthy fisheries to support strong businesses. Once again, we ask that you oppose H.R. 200 to ensure Americans have access to sustainable seafood today and for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

ERIC BRAZER,
Deputy Director.

GULF FISHERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
July 2, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: Please accept this letter from the Gulf Fishermen's Association opposing H.R. 200, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act." The Gulf Fisherman's Association represents commercial fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico who are dependent upon healthy fishery resources to support our way of life.

H.R. 200 is a threat to the success record of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), weakening the science-based management that has made the U.S. a leader in the field. The provisions within H.R. 200 that will add exceptions to rebuilding timelines, exemptions to annual catch limits, and mandate allocation reviews are unnecessary. The Magnuson-Stevens Act in its current form is working and is responsible for rebuilding dozens of stocks. In fact, NOAA's Status of the Stocks released in March showed that overfished stocks are at an all-time low. Why change what's already working?

Additionally, Rep. Graves' Amendment 26 to H.R. 200 makes it clear that this bill is being used to harm commercial snapper and grouper fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico. This amendment would open the door for additional taxation of commercial fishermen through resource rents and royalties. It also is an attempt to eliminate charter-for-hire and commercial representation on the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils by unfairly implying that they have a "fiduciary conflict of interest". The language in this amendment makes us ask the following questions:

Why is it reasonable to impose a tax on commercial fishermen while at the same time eliminating their voice in the decision-making process?

If commercial fishermen should not serve on the Gulf Council because of a supposed financial "conflict of interest," why should marine suppliers and scientists whose companies and universities have received funding from recreational lobbying groups be able to serve?

In conclusion, H.R. 200 is not the fix for our fisheries that it is advertised to be. It threatens to turn back the clock on fisheries management and take us back to a time when there was less fish for everyone. That hurts both commercial and recreational fishermen. It would also damage the Council system, which has been effective at creating regional solutions for their fisheries. Lastly, this bill is a failure in bi-partisanship, as evidenced

by a shortage of democratic co-sponsors and a lack of consideration for all sectors of fisheries. It seeks to help recreational fishermen at the expense of commercial fishermen who work hard to provide this great country with wild sustainable seafood. That's something the Gulf Fishermen's Association cannot support and urge all representatives to vote "no" on H.R. 200.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act." We hope that you will take our concerns seriously and urge you to vote "no".

Sincerely,

GLEN BROOKS.

JULY 9, 2018.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As leading manufacturers, retailers, guides, outfitters and media serving the fly fishing industry, we write to urge you to oppose H.R. 200, a bill that threatens the health and abundance of marine fisheries. H.R. 200, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act," would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). The MSA has been methodically rebuilding fisheries decimated by once-rampant overfishing. Since 2000, forty-four previously overfished stocks have been fully rebuilt, and NOAA Fisheries just reported that the number of overfished stocks is at an all-time low.

Thriving and healthy fish populations are at the heart of our businesses, and saltwater fly fishing is a vibrant and growing segment of our industry. The Magnuson-Stevens Act is working as intended to maximize fishing opportunities while ensuring the long-term sustainability of marine fisheries. Yet the work is not done. While the science-based management required under the Magnuson-Stevens Act has dramatically reduced overfishing, fifteen percent (15%) of assessed fisheries are still overfished. Now is the time to double-down on our proven management system, not undermine it.

Unfortunately, H.R. 200 attacks the very provisions in the Magnuson-Stevens Act that are responsible for putting America's ocean fish on a secure path to full recovery. If enacted, H.R. 200 would allow many different fisheries to be exempted from the annual catch limits and accountability measures identified by independent scientific bodies. Setting clear, science-based limits on catch and enforcing those limits is a hallmark of prudent management. H.R. 200 would also undermine the recovery of fisheries by allowing fisheries managers to relax timelines for rebuilding depleted stocks. Healthy fisheries support the greatest number of angling opportunities, and should be rebuilt as quickly as possible, as currently directed by the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Make no mistake, H.R. 200 seeks to undermine our conservation progress in service of increasing short-term economic gain. As successful business leaders, we assure you that prioritizing the health of our nation's fishery resources is the best way to invest in American businesses like our own. We urge you to vote no on H.R. 200.

Sincerely,

Jeff Patterson, Abel Reels, Montrose, CO; Eli & Tara Lucas, Alaska Coastal Hunting, Kupreanof City, AK; Tim Romano, Angling Trade Media, Boulder, CO; Kirk Deeter, Angling Trade Media, Boulder CO; Greg Blessing, Blessing Enterprises, Colorado Springs, CO; Ted Upton, Cheeky Fishing, Watertown, MA; Ben Kurtz, Fishpond Inc., Denver, CO; John Torok, Hatch Outdoors Inc., Vista, CA; Rick Wittenbraker, Howler Brothers, Austin, TX; John Barrett, JB Fly Fishing, Peoria,

AZ; Abbie Schuster, Kismet Outfitters, Martha's Vineyard, MA; Bob Triggs, Little Stone Flyfisher, Port Townsend, WA; Lucas Bissett, Low Tide Charters, Slidell, LA.

Tom Sadler, Middle River Group, Verona, VA; Colby Trow, Mossy Creek Fly Fishing, Harrisonburg, VA; Chris Gaggia, Patagonia, Ventura, CA; Corrine Doctor, RepYourWater, Erie, CO; Michelle East, River Sister Fly Fishing LLC, Colorado City, CO; Jeff Patterson, Ross Reels, Montrose, CO; Taylor Vavra, Strippers Forever, South Portland, ME; Art Web, Silver Kings Holdings Inc., Tavernier, FL; Tom Bie, The Drake Magazine, Denver, CO; Neville Orsmond, Thomas & Thomas, Greenfield, MA; Scott Hunter, Vedavoo, Leominster, MA; Ted Upton, Wingo Belts, Watertown, MA; Jim Klug, Yellow Dog Fly Fishing Adventures, Bozeman, MT.

SEAFOOD HARVESTERS OF AMERICA

Arlington, VA, July 9, 2018.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We understand that H.R. 200, the "Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act," is on the schedule for floor debate and a vote on Wednesday afternoon. The Seafood Harvesters of America (SHA) remains staunchly opposed to this bill as it would do very little to improve the management of the recreational fishing industry while severely undermining the sacrifices the commercial fishing industry has made to ensure that we are sustainably harvesting fisheries resources.

The Seafood Harvesters of America is a broadly-based organization that represents commercial fishermen and their associations. Our members reflect the diversity of America's coastal communities, the complexity of our marine environments, and the enormous potential of our commercial fisheries. As domestic harvesters of an American public resource, we recognize and embrace our stewardship responsibility. We strive for accountability in our fisheries, encourage others to do the same, and speak out on issues of common concern that affect the U.S. commercial fishing industry, the stewardship of our public resources, and the many millions of Americans who enjoy seafood.

In addition to the threats posed by H.R. 200 as we've outlined in previous letters (below), we are concerned with a proposed amendment to H.R. 200 that will be debated during the floor vote. Specifically, we are concerned with Amendment #26 which directs the General Accountability Office to develop a report to Congress on the "resource rent" of Limited Access Privilege Programs (LAPPs) in the Gulf of Mexico and Southeast, and examine "fiduciary conflicts of interest" on these Regional Fishery Management Councils. First, by studying only LAPPs without also studying recreational fishing and non-LAPP fisheries, this language unfairly singles out LAPPs and is aimed at attacking these successful programs. Commercial fishermen already pay for their commercial permits, quota, licenses, vessel registration, business taxes, observer costs, among other costs. On top of that, fishermen in LAPPs pay an additional fee to recover costs of administering the program. There is no reason to limit an analysis of the fishing value extracted to LAPPs and such a biased analysis would lead to false conclusions. Second, the Regional Fishery Management Councils were purposely created to involve fishery stakeholders from all sectors in the Council process to guide policy and regulations. The process by which Council Members are appointed is thorough and well-vetted, and already requires financial disclosure of their fishing interests. This language shows a misunderstanding of the Council structure designed within the Magnuson-Stevens Act

(MSA). Targeting commercial and charter fishermen representatives on Councils for these two regions would not only undermine the intended Council appointment process to encourage stakeholder participation in management of our fisheries resources, but set a dangerous precedent for the rest of the country.

As we've outlined in our previous letters, the Harvesters remain opposed to H.R. 200 because of a number of sections that pose a direct threat to sustainable fisheries management:

(1) H.R. 200 risks overfishing and imperils rebuilding of overfished species

Despite significant flexibility already incorporated into the MSA, Section 303 establishes multiple exceptions to the rebuilding timeline. Congress previously strengthened the rebuilding timeline requirements because many fish stocks were not recovering and were at risk of continued overfishing. Without this statutory standard, rebuilding timelines could vary dramatically, perpetuating depleted stock conditions and harming our businesses' bottom lines.

Overfishing has been illegal since the MSA was first signed into law in 1976, but the 2007 requirement for annual catch limits (ACLs) truly put an end to the practice. Section 204 waives the requirement for ACLs for a large number of species, including virtually all by-catch species and many fish that are caught in international waters, significantly raising the risk of overfishing.

Repealing MSA Section 407 entirely (Section 306 in H.R. 200) would remove backstops against recreational quota overages and allocations for Gulf of Mexico red snapper which, combined with H.R. 200's sweeping ACL exemptions, increases the risk of overfishing and makes it difficult for management bodies to allocate quota to prevent quota overages.

(2) H.R. 200 hinders Councils' ability to manage our fishery resources

Councils already have the flexibility to conduct allocation reviews as necessary, so requiring that the South Atlantic and Gulf Councils conduct a review of commercial and recreational allocations every 5 years (Section 202) is duplicative, costly, and would effectively prevent these Councils from having the time and money to manage the resource (i.e. stock assessments, habitat management, among other responsibilities).

Section 304 establishes a suite of procedures that would make the use of Exempted Fishing Permits (EFPs) nearly impossible, removing a pathway for Councils to work with industry to develop and test innovative gear, fishing, and management technologies aimed at improving resource management. Additionally, this Section bans the use of EFPs to test for Limited Access Privilege Programs (LAPPs).

(3) H.R. 200 would impose unnecessary Congressional interference

Fishermen are deeply involved in the development of catch share programs, which often take years of deliberation with extensive public input. Under current law, Councils can require referenda on these programs at their discretion. Mandating additional referenda and specifying who should be allowed to vote in them is unnecessarily intrusive to the Council process and creates undue hurdles to catch share development (Section 205). While we recognize that a catch share program may not be appropriation for every fishery, we feel strongly that this management tool should remain a viable option.

We are disappointed to see this bill move along near partisan lines. The reauthorization of the MSA has traditionally been a bipartisan effort that advances the sustainability of our nation's fisheries. Instead,

what we see today is a partisan effort to advance the interests of the recreational fishing industry at the expense and to the detriment of the commercial fishing industry.

As thousands of commercial fishermen around the country stand in opposition to this bill, we urge House Leadership to reconsider bringing this bill to the House floor for a vote. We are serve as a direct connection to the ocean for many inland citizens and we take our responsibility as stewards of the ocean very seriously. We stand ready to work with Mr. Young and others to develop a bill that works for all sectors and progresses fisheries management across the board.

We appreciate your consideration of our request. Please reach out to our Executive Director, Leigh Habegger, should you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER BROWN,
President,
Seafood Harvesters of America.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

Alaska Whitefish Trawlers Association; Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance; Cordova District Fishermen United; Fishing Vessel Owners' Association; Fort Bragg Groundfish Association; Georges Bank Fixed Gear Cod Sector, Inc; Gulf Fishermen's Association; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance; Midwater Trawlers Cooperative; New Hampshire Groundfish Sectors; North Pacific Fisheries Association; Purse Seine Vessel Owners Association; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Association; South Atlantic Fishermen's Association; United Catcher Boats.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD this column recently written by the head of the National Marine Fisheries Service and also the chief scientist for the National Marine Fisheries Service under the Bush administration.

I would like to call special attention to this statement by these experts from the Bush administration, who say: "We believe this is an ill-conceived, dangerous piece of legislation that would undermine the tremendous progress in fisheries rebuilding and sustainable management that has occurred since the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 2007."

DON'T HURT FISHERIES WITH DANGEROUS
LEGISLATION

(By William Hogarth and Steven Murawski,
special to the Tampa Bay Times)

This Wednesday the U.S. House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on H.R. 200, the Strengthen Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. We believe this is an ill-conceived, dangerous piece of legislation that would undermine the tremendous progress in fisheries rebuilding and sustainable management that has occurred since the latest reauthorizations of the Magnuson Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act in 2007.

Since 2007, more than 40 of the most overfished and historically important fish stocks in the nation have been recovered. Overfishing now occurs for fewer than 10 percent of stocks, the lowest proportion since records have been kept. Rebuilding stocks has resulted in increases in fisheries yields and translated into lower prices to consumers, more business-friendly approaches to commercial fisheries management and more healthy recreational fisheries.

The term "flexibility" in H.R. 200 is a code word that would undermine timely, effective management of stocks when downturns inevitably occur. Heavy on requirements for studies and other administrative requirements, H.R. 200 would make fisheries management more cumbersome. The bill as written would delay timely, effective conservation responses and would limit the flexibility to use innovative management tools. Healthy fisheries without healthy stocks is a non sequitur. We urge the House to reject this piece of legislation that seeks to solve problems that simply do not exist.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has 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 title II add the following:

SEC. —. NORTHEAST REGIONAL PILOT RESEARCH TRAWL SURVEY AND STUDY.

(a) INDUSTRY-BASED PILOT STUDY.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall, in coordination with the relevant Councils selected by the Secretary and the Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (NEAMAP), develop a fishing industry-based Northeast regional pilot research trawl survey and study to enhance and provide improvement to current National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel trawl surveys.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Under the pilot survey and study—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) may select fishing industry vessels to participate in the study by issuing a request for procurement;

(B) may use the NEAMAP Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Nearshore Trawl Survey as a model for the pilot survey; and

(C) shall outfit participating vessels with a peer-reviewed net configuration; and

(2) the selected Councils shall, in partnership with the National Marine Fisheries Service Northeast Fisheries Science Center and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, collect data and evaluate discrepancies between fishing industry vessel data and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration vessel data, for 5 years.

(b) REPORT.—Upon completion of the pilot survey and study, the Secretary and the selected Councils shall submit a detailed report on the results of the pilot survey and study to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning, I first of all want to salute both Mr. YOUNG and Mr. HUFFMAN for their hard work on this legislation, which is very contentious and requires a lot of interests to be balanced. Again, hopefully, as the process moves forward through the next Chamber, we will get to that sweet spot for good policy for our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment at the desk is a simple amendment, which creates a 5-year, industry-based pilot trawl survey for the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils. Such a program would follow the model industry-based trawl surveys used in the Pacific Northwest under NOAA's supervision that have been a great success.

The reason I am offering this bipartisan amendment with Congressman LEE ZELDIN from New York is that NOAA trawl surveys have been seriously hampered by a string of mechanical and performance problems with NOAA's ship Henry B. Bigelow over the last 2 years.

For example, from August 2017 to March 2018, Bigelow missed several trawls while in its shipyard for chronic propulsion problems. Even when the Bigelow is operational, one-third of its trawls are not performing, and these bad trawls generally have yields that are 67 percent lower than when it performs properly.

These problems are unacceptable, given the critical importance of that data to accurately calculate catch limits on the East Coast, which, as we have heard, is a highly contentious issue.

In addition to the Bigelow's gear issues, the vessel is too large for near-shore studies. It draws a lot of water and cannot enter shallow littoral areas to trawl. Because of that, NOAA already contracts with the Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program, NEAMAP, to survey shallower areas. NEAMAP contracts industry vessels outfitted with peer-reviewed NOAA gear for near-shore surveys, proving that surveying can be done on industry vessels.

I want to emphasize that this pilot program contemplated in the amendment will be a pilot program coordinated with NOAA, the councils, and industry. While we don't dictate a specific framework, we recommend that the pilot mirror the NEAMAP survey, which the executive directors of both the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils have described as the gold standard of cooperative, collaborative fisheries surveys.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a responsible initiative to solve a real-life problem using a trusted precedent in the Pacific Northwest and under the careful supervision of NOAA and fisheries experts.

I want to thank the Northeast Trawl Advisory Panel for bringing attention to the trawl gaps that are happening on the East Coast and working with my office to craft this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who sponsored the bill.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, JOE COURTNEY from Connecticut, for his bipartisan cooperation on this and so many other issues that are important to the hardworking men and women who make their living on the Long Island Sound, a precious waterway we are both so fortunate to represent.

This amendment creates an industry-based trawl survey program for the New England and Mid-Atlantic regions. Improving survey data so that the quotas and regulations imposed on our fishermen are transparent, equitable, and fair is a critical goal of the underlying bill, and it is the purpose of this important bipartisan amendment.

Increasing industry buy-in and cooperation with the NOAA survey program is essential for improving data collection. Without the right data, fishermen in our region will continue to be shortchanged while their counterparts in the Pacific Northwest are already benefiting from increased cooperation between NOAA and the private sector.

What we have right now in our region is a massive failure on behalf of NOAA because their vessel has fudged trawl after trawl. The people who work on the water every day have the equipment, the vessels, and the expertise to get this important data collection done, and done right.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this amendment, and I commend my friend from Connecticut for his hard work on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work together with him and others on bipartisan solutions to help our hardworking commercial fishermen, charter boat captains, and all the small businesses that are a part of the coastal economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, 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 section 209 (page 27, after line 7) add the following:

(F) ADDITION OF RHODE ISLAND TO THE MID-ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.—Section 302(a)(1)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "Rhode Island," after "States of";

(2) by inserting "Rhode Island," after "except North Carolina,";

(3) by striking "21" and inserting "23"; and

(4) by striking "13" and inserting "14".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, today I offer an amendment with immense importance to Rhode Island fishermen. My amendment would provide voting representation for Rhode Island on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, which regulates numerous species found in the waters off our coast.

I want to emphasize that this is not a provincial matter. This is about providing fair representation and a sense of equity for those invested in our regional fisheries council system. It only makes sense that those who haul in these fish species should have a seat at the table.

Mr. Chairman, despite our location in New England, we do haul in these so-called Mid-Atlantic species. Using the most recent statistics, Rhode Island lands half of all squid caught on the East Coast.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. Half of all squid caught on the East Coast is landed by Ocean State fishermen. These squid are the key ingredient in the famous Rhode Island calamari, a dish that many of us undoubtedly enjoy.

Beyond squid, Rhode Island lands 85 percent of all East Coast butterflyfish, far exceeding any other State. Butterflyfish is regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council. We haul in more scup than any other East Coast State. Scup is also regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

Additionally, we are among the top three States for landing bluefish, summer flounder, and monkfish. Mr. Chairman, bluefish, summer flounder, and monkfish are all regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council. For our recreational fishermen, summer flounder, black sea bass, bluefish, and scup comprise the bulk of the recreational harvest in Rhode Island.

So, Mr. Chairman, it should also be noted that the Rhode Island Sound is a part of the Mid-Atlantic Bight. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are a part of the same marine ecosystem that stretches down to the Outer Banks

of North Carolina. The same species live all along these waters, and they are regulated by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

While this inequity already exists today, the threat of climate change will only make this worse as species migrate northward in search of colder waters.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that there is precedent for such a change. In 1996, we amended fisheries law to ensure that North Carolina could sit on two regional fisheries councils. All we ask is the same consideration be provided to Rhode Island. It is only fair.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the intent of my good friend's amendment, but I reluctantly oppose it.

The amendment would begin to unravel, I believe, this council's structure that was made in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the gold standard of global fisheries management. At best, it erodes MSA's emphasis on regional management.

Fish stocks migrate up and down the Atlantic coast frequently incorporated in a prospective of States invested in shared fishery resources, a goal we all share. That is why Congress authorized the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and why my bill before us today creates a liaison between the Mid-Atlantic Council and the New England Council and vice versa.

These two mechanisms adequately address overlapping Atlantic coast fisheries without undermining the fundamental council structure.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would point out to my friend, whom I have deep respect for, that there is precedent for such a change.

In 1996, we amended fisheries law to ensure that North Carolina could, in fact, sit on two regional fisheries councils, so what we are asking is not unprecedented.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Congressman LANGEVIN. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of my colleague's legislation, the Fishermen's Fairness Act, which serves as the basis for this amendment.

This amendment would provide our home State of Rhode Island with representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council. This move

would allow Rhode Island fishing communities to have a voice on the council which manages stocks for species that are among the most valuable to fisheries in our State.

Rhode Island fishermen account for nearly 56 percent of total summer scup landings and 54 percent of all Atlantic squid landings, both stocks being managed by the Mid-Atlantic Council.

Squid landings are critical to Rhode Island's overall fishing economy, landing more squid than all other States combined and the second most of any other State in the country. In 2015, Rhode Island landed roughly 16 million pounds of squid, nearly 12 million pounds more than its nearest competitor.

□ 1615

The following year was even more significant for Rhode Island, with nearly 23 million pounds in squid landings valued at more than \$29 million.

All told, Rhode Island accounts for more fish landings under the jurisdiction of the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council than any other State in the region, with the exception of New Jersey.

Yet, despite all of this, my State does not have a seat on this council, leaving Rhode Island fisheries without a say in how a significant portion of its industry is managed.

This amendment will provide a commonsense solution to this problem by adding two additional seats to the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council in order to represent Rhode Island's interests in the region.

As Congressman LANGEVIN said, this is not unprecedented. We have done this before. In 1996, North Carolina, which also had significant fishing interests in the mid-Atlantic region, was given a seat on the council. This amendment would extend this same right to a seat at the table to my State.

I really want to thank my colleague for his work on this issue, and I strongly encourage adoption of this amendment, particularly out of a sense of comity, since we have done this in the past. Rhode Islanders deserve to be treated fairly. Our fishermen deserve a voice. I urge my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 37, strike lines 5 through 6 (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs accordingly).

Page 38, after line 7, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent quoted subclauses accordingly):

“(IV) the new plan, amendment, or proposed regulation has at least a 75 percent chance of rebuilding the overfished fishery within the time limit proposed by the Council, as calculated by the scientific and statistical committee of the Council with jurisdiction over the fishery pursuant to section 302(g)(1)(B);

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this bill argue that the requirement to rebuild overfished stocks needs more “flexibility,” but it is important to note that the Magnuson Act already provides a lot of flexibility.

While I am fully aware that it isn't always easy or popular to implement fishing restrictions, management tools like annual catch limits and rebuilding plans are essential to ensuring a future for our fisheries and fishing industry.

In my district, fishermen went through several tough years while groundfish stocks were depleted. Magnuson provided the scientific and regulatory framework to bring those fisheries back. We have now rebuilt half of our groundfish species, and more are on the way to recovery.

These accomplishments certainly did not come easily. Our fishermen had to make sacrifices. But the long-term health of our fisheries and communities that depend on them in making these tough decisions has benefited from it. That is why these decisions were supported by commercial and recreational fishermen. That support has been integral to sustaining the fisheries that are critical for West Coast communities. This success story, by the way, has been replicated around the country time and again.

Our success and the sustainability of the fishing industry rely on harvesting from healthy and productive fish stocks. Fishing restrictions are only put in place because they are absolutely necessary. If there aren't enough fish to support strong harvests both now and in the future, we have no choice but to cut back in order to avoid the tragedy of the commons.

It is important to note that the law allows councils to delay rebuilding when the biology of the stock, environmental conditions, or international management considerations present challenges. Because of these broad but fair exemptions, more than 50 percent of all overfished stocks today have rebuilding plans that are longer than the 10-year baseline in the act. So there is flexibility, and it is being used.

Further, current law gives councils 2 years to put a rebuilding plan in place and another year to reduce rather than end overfishing. That is 3 years of lead time before significant harvest restrictions go into effect.

My amendment requires that an exemption to strong rebuilding timelines would only be permitted if rebuilding plans have at least a 75 percent chance of success. That is contrasted with the 50 percent chance of success that ordinarily applies to rebuilding plans.

Now, I am proud that, without being required to do so, most of the West Coast groundfish fishery recovery plans have a greater than 75 percent chance of meeting their rebuilding goals, and we have seen the success of that. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of all the regions.

The bottom line is that we should not be weakening standards unless we have a very robust rebuilding plan in place. That is what this amendment addresses.

I want to note that, in addition to all of that, the current Magnuson Act requires a rebuilding timeline be as short as possible. H.R. 200 would change that requirement to be as short as practicable. This is a very problematic weakening of the law, with real consequences.

Currently, the agency has to do whatever is possible, whatever is feasible. Practicable is a lower standard. It means the stocks would not be built in a reasonable timeframe, and this change could even allow the agency to do little or nothing to rebuild a stock.

History has shown us what happens if we don't do that. We need to tackle rebuilding aggressively in order to succeed. Rebuilding plans that take a weak approach to harvest or drag on rebuilding for many years inevitably fail.

So, unless the law is very clear and strong on this point, managers could choose not to deal with rebuilding situations proactively. My amendment addresses this to be sure that we continue to see fish stocks rebuild so that fishermen can ultimately reap the rewards.

Mr. Chairman, I request an “aye” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would not only hamstring the flexibility of rebuilding fish stocks that this bill provides, it would add serious bureaucratic delays in the development of fishery management plans across the country.

Furthermore, according to NOAA, this amendment would eliminate some of the flexibility currently provided under the national standard, one which was updated under the Obama administration, and would cause an unnecessary reduction in the catch.

NOAA also expressed concerns regarding the potential impact on international fishing agreements that would

change how the U.S. can negotiate on rebuilding plans. According to a letter authored by the National Coalition for Fishing Communities, this amendment would undermine the act, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter to the leadership of the House and to myself where they say such an amendment sponsored by Mr. JARED HUFFMAN of California and Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS of Florida will ensure it does not: “We believe it would actually undermine the MSA, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities around the country, including in California and Florida, the home States of Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. HASTINGS.”

NATIONAL COALITION
FOR FISHING COMMUNITIES,

July 10, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, United States House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

SPEAKER RYAN AND MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: H.R. 200 (formerly H.R. 1335), the “Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act” is the product of three Managing our Nations Fisheries (“MONF”) conferences, and numerous hearings with well over a hundred witnesses (from 2009 through 2017). These many efforts were held in large part to address unintended consequences in the implementation of the 2006 reauthorization.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) has largely been a success, but no law is perfect, and H.R. 200 contains a number of important updates and refinements. But as a result of a barrage of last-minute amendments, proposed outside of the committee process, years of hard work to create honest reform of the MSA is now in jeopardy.

One such amendment, sponsored by Congressman Jared Huffman (D-California) and Alcee Hastings (D-Florida) purports to “ensure that rebuilding plans are successful in rebuilding overfished fish stocks.” However, we believe it would actually undermine the MSA, impede reforms that are desperately needed, and attack jobs in coastal communities around the country, including in California and Florida, the home states of Mr. Huffman and Mr. Hastings.

In a letter delivered to their offices on last week, we asked Mr. Huffman and Mr. Hastings to please explain to us how they foresee that this amendment could be enacted without having the effect of reducing commercial, charter and recreational fishing quotas significantly. We also asked that since they represent California and Florida, and since our membership includes members who represent fishing interests in California and Florida, that they explain how they see this amendment improving conditions for seafood harvesters and processors in your respective home states. Unfortunately we did not receive a response to those questions.

In the provisions contained in this amendment were implemented, the required theoretical probability of management measures rebuilding a stock in the shortest time period as possible would increase from 50% to 75% for many species. The “Huffman-Hastings Amendment” would impose a burden on many U.S.-managed fisheries.

While this sounds like an innocuous effort to strengthen and improve the law, the fact

is, the only way to meet the requirements of the amendment would be to significantly reduce many commercial, charter and recreational fishing quotas significantly. Considering the status of U.S. fish stocks recently described in NOAA’s 2018 Report to Congress as “Overfishing remains near all time lows and we reached a new milestone with the number of overfished stocks at the lowest level ever”, the validity and intent of the “Huffman Amendment” should be seriously questioned.

Why, if the current Act’s requirements are having success in rebuilding stocks, is there a reason to require the law to be substantially more conservative?

In addition, the amendment removes a subtle but important update to the MSA.

Section 304 of MSA states that “For a fishery that is overfished, any fishery management plan, amendment, or proposed regulations . . . shall . . . specify a time period for rebuilding the fishery that shall . . . be as short as possible, taking into account the status and biology of any overfished stocks of fish, the needs of fishing communities, recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates, and the interaction of the overfished stock of fish within the marine ecosystem.”

There is widespread support to change the term “possible” to “practicable” in this section. The intent of this change is not to compromise or weaken the effectiveness of the MSA, but rather to help better fulfill one of the fundamental and original goals of the Act, emphasized in National Standard 1—to prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis the optimum yield from each fishery. Changing the terminology from “possible” to “practicable” would provide Regional Fishery Management Councils with much-needed flexibility and the option to choose between several rebuilding scenarios to achieve specified conservation and management objectives, not just the shortest and, quite often, most harmful to fishing communities.

We must remain committed to restoring common sense to MSA. We must not undermine our Nation’s fisheries law in the name of improving it, and cause harm to commercial charter and recreational fishermen from Alaska to Maine.

Coastal communities and fishing families are relying on the passage of clean legislation, as developed in committee.

We urge Members to vote NO on the Huffman Amendment to H.R. 200!

Sincerely,

American Scallop Association, John Whiteside, General Counsel, Members in MA, NJ, NC; Ariel Seafoods, David Krebs, Owner, FL; Atlantic Capes Fisheries, Dan Cohen, Owner, MA, NJ; Atlantic Red Crab Co., Jon Williams, Owner, MA; California Wetfish Producers Association, Diane Pleschner-Steele, CA; Fishermen’s Dock Co-Op, Jim Lovgren, Board Member, NJ; Fishing Partnership Support Services, J.J. Bartlett, Executive Director, MA; Florida Keys Commercial Fishermen’s Association, Bill Kelly, Executive Director, FL; Garden State Seafood Association, Greg DiDomenico, Executive Director, NJ; Gulf Coast Seafood Association, David Krebs, Founding Member, FL, AL; Hawaii Longline Association, Sean Martin, Owner, HI.

Inlet Seafood, William Grimm, Secretary and Treasurer, NY; Long Island Commercial Fishermen’s Association, Bonnie Brady, Executive Director, NY; Lunds Fisheries, Inc., Jeff Reichle, Chairman, CA, NJ; North Carolina Fisheries Association, Glen Skinner, Executive Director, NC; Pacific Seafood, Jon Gonzales, Fisheries Policy Analyst, OR, WA; Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen’s Association, Rich Fuka, Executive Director, RI;

Seafreeze, Ltd., Meghan Lapp, Fisheries Liaison, RI; Southeastern Fisheries Association, Bob Jones, Executive Director, FL; Viking Village, Jim Gutowski, Owner, NJ; West Coast Seafood Processors Association, Lori Steele, Executive Director, CA, WA, OR; Western Fishboat Owners Association, Wayne Heikkila, Executive Director, AK, CA, OR, WA.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting, respectfully, that this amendment is uncalled for and, frankly, will gut the bill and the MSA, period.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to reject 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 California (Mr. HUFFMAN). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. ____ . MITIGATION FOR IMPACTS TO SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION.

Requirements to conserve or to provide compensatory mitigation for impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation under section 305(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1855(b)) shall not apply when a non-Federal entity conducts maintenance dredging for an authorized Federal navigation project on an inland waterway, inlet, or harbor located in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida pursuant to a permit issued under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) or section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 403; 30 Stat. 1151, chapter 425).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I rise today on behalf of my colleague from Florida, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL, to offer a nonpartisan amendment that Ms. FRANKEL and I have been working on for some time.

The amendment applies common sense to routine maintenance and dredging in the inland navigational channels. Specifically, this amendment would waive a duplicative requirement for routine maintenance dredging.

When a waterway is initially dredged, the project sponsor has to mitigate for the impact on aquatic vegetation like seagrass. In the Florida Intracoastal Waterway, seagrass grows like a weed and must be routinely dredged to keep it clear. Unfortunately, the project sponsor is required

to do costly environmental mitigation every time just to keep the waterway open and operating, instead of using the permit that has already been given and the mitigation that has already happened for that particular area. This additional round of mitigation is unnecessary, since seagrass removal has already been accounted for in the environmental review for the initial dredging.

Florida's Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway requires routine maintenance dredging akin to mowing your grass. The waterway annually transports tons of commercial cargo and is used by more than 500,000 recreational vehicles. It provides \$30 billion in economic output, including \$3 billion in wages, creates 155,000 jobs, and generates more than \$540 million in tax revenues. Without regular maintenance dredging, this powerful economic driver is at risk.

This amendment itself is limited in scope and maintains an existing environmental protection while ensuring that the maintenance dredging mitigation requirements make sense.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it would set a bad precedent by waiving the requirements to provide compensatory mitigation for federally authorized maintenance dredging projects in inland waterways, inlets, or harbors located in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

As it should, Magnuson requires compensatory mitigation to protect essential fish habitat, including seagrass. This mitigation requires the restoration, establishment, enhancement, and/or preservation of aquatic resources to offset unavoidable adverse impacts from activities like dredging.

Many of the inland waterways in the Southeast that need maintenance dredging are actually home to seagrasses, so these States are required to mitigate the negative impacts. Compensatory mitigation is the most obvious, commonsense solution for offsetting the damage to these important habitats.

Fish depend on healthy seagrass habitats to survive and reproduce, not only in the Southeast but all across the Nation's coasts, including in my district.

Moreover, we need all the help that we can get to recover seagrasses. Globally, 30 percent of seagrass meadows have disappeared. Of the seagrasses that remain, nearly a quarter are threatened or near threatened. In fact, the only marine plant listed as endangered in the United States is a seagrass found in Florida.

Seagrasses are highly productive hotspots for biodiversity and can act as

a carbon sink, making this habitat a critical component in buffering oceans against the impacts of climate change. Protecting and restoring essential fish habitat and seagrass is very important to maintain productive fisheries and healthy oceans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will say this. This is so duplicative and ridiculous. It is typical government regulation.

Here you have an inland waterway, the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. The seagrass removal has been already mitigated. That requires maintenance. As you do maintenance, you have to come back and do more mitigation on the exact same piece of property for the same seagrass.

It is ridiculous; it is duplicative; and I submit it is a good amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I am sitting here listening to this. These channels were built for navigation and commercial use by taxpayers' dollars many years ago, and the seagrass grows back. Each time, they mitigate when trying to maintain it. Where is the logic?

Where is the logic when we built those channels with American tax dollars for commerce and now, each time they dredge it—they already dredged it once—it grows back and they have to come back and file another ES statement. Why are we doing this?

□ 1630

Who is this helping out? Not the fish because the eelgrass grows back again, because they have to dredge it again. It costs money, slows down commerce, and that is interfering with the economy of this country.

I have been through these channels. They can't show me where the dredging hurts. In fact, it helps. It is like you said, mowing the grass. You let it grow too long, you are going to get in trouble. We let this eelgrass grow too long, you are going to hurt the channel or you are going to hurt the fish in the long run.

So I compliment the gentleman on his amendment, and I will support this amendment strongly.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will close by stating that I can appreciate the frustration that the gentleman may be feeling, feeling like this is a process of remitigating for the same thing over and over again.

I think it is a little more complicated than that, but if the gentleman is willing to work going forward on some ways to perhaps consolidate the regulatory burden and find something for the long term that provides a little more certainty and streamlining, I would be happy to work with him on that.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. . . . REPORT ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO GULF OF MEXICO AND SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERIES.

No later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the resource rent of limited access privilege programs in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean;

(2) how to reclaim resource rent in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic as revenue the United States Treasury; and

(3) the fiduciary conflicts of interest in the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and effective ways to eliminate such conflicts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a modified amendment at the desk be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. . . . REPORT ON LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGE PROGRAMS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO GULF OF MEXICO AND SOUTH ATLANTIC OCEAN RED SNAPPER.

(a) STUDY.—No later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(1) the resource rent of limited access privilege programs for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean;

(2) how to reclaim resource rent for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean as revenue to the United States Treasury; and

(3) the fiduciary conflicts of interest in the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South Atlantic Fishery Management

Council relating to red snapper, and effective ways to eliminate such conflicts.

(b) LIMITATION.—In implementing this section the Comptroller General shall not consider—

(1) fisheries programs in any region other than the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic Ocean; and

(2) fisheries management programs for species other than red snapper.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The ACTING Chair. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply authorizes a GAO study, a Government Accountability Office study, for the purposes of evaluating how we currently manage the red snapper species in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic.

I want to be very clear, Mr. Chairman. This amendment does not affect any other region of the Nation. It doesn't affect any other species. It is a unique scenario that we are facing in the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic pertaining to the red snapper.

This is a species where the increased demand from both recreational and commercial fishers has resulted in contentious debate and challenging situations for resource managers across the Gulf Coast and the South Atlantic.

This amendment is designed to have the GAO perform a study that would provide information to resource managers. We have been able to work through EFPs for the past 2 years, but in the future we are not guaranteed any type of solution.

When I was a child, we could fish for red snapper year-round. We are no longer allowed to do that. We were limited by as many as 3 days—proposed—by the Federal Government in recent years. This is designed to provide better information, better tools for how we manage these species moving forward in a sustainable manner.

Mr. Chairman, the modifications that I made to this amendment were a result of discussions with Members near me right now.

As a matter of fact, someone sitting near me may or may not have threatened to fillet me with a butter knife if I didn't change some text in the amendment, so some of the text has been changed to reflect the very narrow scope of this amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, regrettably, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. GRAVES. This amendment requires the Comptroller General to submit a report to Congress, but it is unclear what the overall purpose of this report would be.

In fact, because of the vagueness of that purpose, there has been concern that it may be about identifying what would happen if the overall value of the red snapper fishery commercial quota was completely taken away or given to private anglers. Would this report be used to make the argument that the red snapper quota should be reallocated to recreational fishermen? I can't support either of those propositions, nor a reporting requirement with such ambiguous goals and potentially significant impacts on the fishery.

When it comes to setting these allocations, picking winners and losers from among commercial and recreational fishing interests, that should be the job of regional councils, not of Congress. In fact, the entire structure of Magnuson and the council system is designed to encourage stakeholder participation on the councils, from a regional perspective.

We need to let the fishery management councils do their job and not have Congress micromanaging these type of decisions.

It is unclear, also, why this amendment only targets limited access privilege permits. Every type of commercial or recreational fishing activity could be viewed as having a "resource rent." So it is questionable that every other form of commercial and recreational activity would be excluded from this type of report. There is no reason why an analysis of the economic value commercial and recreational fishermen extract from a Federal resource would be limited to just catch share programs.

Finally, with respect to the conflict of interest provisions in this bill, I would have supported—and I have talked to the gentleman about this—this amendment, had it been a report on ways to eliminate conflicts of interest on all fishery management councils, because there are concerns, bipartisan concerns, in that regard, and it is something that should be addressed to improve fishery management in all councils.

Unfortunately, this seems to be a rather targeted and direct attack on what many view as a well-managed commercial red snapper fishery, and we should not be devoting public resources to such a report.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for modifying this amendment. I still have concerns, as I have told the gentleman. I know the problem.

If I ever hear about a red snapper again, we change this to the Graves

snapper. That is what we are going to call it. I know there is a problem, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to strengthen the language and, especially, to making sure this does not include any other areas, because I want Alaska and the Pacific Northwest left out. I will say that is being selfish, but I know what the gentleman over there said.

I understand what the gentleman is trying to do here. We have a little ways to go. We will work together and try to get something done.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the concerns raised by the gentleman from Alaska. I am committed to working with the gentleman and to working with my friend from California in trying to get this amendment in a better posture. I do want to work together with both the gentlemen to make sure that we get this done in a way that does not cause injury to other places.

In response to my friend from California, I do want to be clear that this is information. All this is is information that our committee, that this Congress, would then have the option to act upon.

I don't think information in this case, on such a contentious issue, that does have a very unclear future—we have dealt with contentious issues and bought ourselves 2 years. Beyond that, we are going to be right back in the same situation.

We are trying to get additional information. I want to say, in regard to the conflict issues, in regard to the balance of commercial and recreational, that is good feedback, and I am happy to adopt those changes to the amendment, to include those as we work through the process.

I will say it again. I am committed to working with the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I sent the gentleman the text of the amendment—the first person I sent it to—to ensure that I had input from both sides. We did make some modifications as a result, the changes requested by Mr. YOUNG, but I am committed to working together with the dean and with the gentleman from California to perfect this as we move forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. —. PLAN FOR ELECTRONIC MONITORING
AND REPORTING PROCEDURES FOR
THE NORTHEAST MULTISPECIES
FISHERY.

The Secretary, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall submit a plan to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate not less than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that will establish fully operational electronic monitoring and reporting procedures for the Northeast Multispecies Fishery by not later than September 30, 2021. The plan shall include the proposal of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to cover vessel equipment and installation costs, with daily, half-day, or quarter-day operational costs to be borne by the fishing vessels.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, my amendment requires the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to develop a strategy for how they plan to implement electronic monitoring in the Northeast Multi-Species Fishery by 2021.

Today, the majority of monitoring is conducted by at-sea, in-person monitors who NOAA sends on only about 30 percent of the trips. What is more, vessel owners must pay the cost of this in-person monitoring, at a cost of \$900 a day. Not only is this a financial burden, especially on the small boat fleet owners, but it is also less effective because it leaves massive gaps for bad actors to exploit the system.

Modernizing fisheries monitoring programs by the full-scale adoption of electronic monitoring is critical for the future sustainability and the development of the North Atlantic's multispecies fishery. Full implementation of electronic monitoring will mean better data for making stock assessments and making sure that every fishing trip is monitored. This means better protections for our environment and more sustainable fisheries so that our fishing industry can remain strong for the generations to come.

This is why, in my district, there is already broad support among fishermen for moving to an electronic monitoring regime. It costs less. It rewards fishermen who play by the rules. It ensures that sustainability of the fisheries that their industry depends upon goes forward.

In fact, the Northeast Fisheries Council has already outlined the goal of total adoption of an electronic monitoring regime. However, NOAA's Marine Fishery Service does not have a strategy in place to make that goal a reality. Without an implementation strategy from NOAA, fishermen who elect to invest in electronic monitoring

for their vessels would still be subject to the costly at-sea monitoring regime, so, in effect, would be forced to pay twice.

We need to move forward on this issue, take advantage of the new technologies that not only make it cheaper and easier to monitor, but more effective as well. We have an opportunity for a win-win scenario, but it requires that we commit to pursuing it.

Step one is NOAA reporting to Congress on what full implementation of the electronic monitoring should look like and by focusing first on the Northeast region. This strategy will serve as a model for other fishery regions around the country as they take their own steps towards adopting electronic monitoring across the country.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. This is long overdue.

We have the technology. The imposition of putting bodies on board ships that don't really do anything, and I don't think make a great count, can be done better through technology. So I compliment the gentleman on his amendment, and I will be supporting his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska. I think the gentleman understands full well that that monitor on the ship poses very challenging times from the time that they are on that ship, and the \$900 a day is simply something that fishermen can't afford right now. It is not necessary.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska for joining with me in this effort, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. POLIQUIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. POLIQUIN. 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:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. —01. STUDY OF FEES CHARGED TO LOBSTER
FISHING INDUSTRY.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall study and report to the Congress on all fees imposed by such Administration on the lobster fishing industry.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman

from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman YOUNG very much for this opportunity to be here.

Mr. Chairman, "Maine is Vacationland." Everybody in the country and everybody on this floor should know that. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we put "vacationland" on our license plates just to make sure everybody knows that.

Our population in the great State of Maine is 1.3 million hardy souls, but we have 40 million people vacation in our State every year. We have 3,000 miles of breathtaking coastline and hundreds and hundreds of clear lakes and streams and hundreds of miles of swift-running streams and rivers.

Everybody that is stressed out in this country, Mr. Chairman, should go to Maine and have their summer vacation because, Mr. Chairman, the tourist industry in the State of Maine employs about 150,000 people.

Maine, Mr. Chairman, is also lobster. There isn't a person in this country who does not relate the great State of Maine to lobsters. Now, I know Mr. Chairman over here has some great critters up in Alaska called crabs, king crabs. Now, they are a good species, but Maine lobsters are a great species, and we need to stand up for our lobsters, Mr. Chairman.

On the water in the State of Maine, on the water we have 10,000 jobs that support our lobster industry—10,000. These are folks who pull traps in their stern.

We have a terrific staffer, Mr. Chairman, here on this committee, Bill Ball, who got through college pulling lobster traps. It is hard work, very hard work.

In addition to the folks who pull the traps, we have folks on land who process them and ship them all over the world. It is a \$1 billion industry, all said, in the State of Maine.

Mr. Chairman, when these folks rise before the Sun comes up and they head out to sea, sometimes in January and February, they are pulling up to 800 traps, and they get their critters on the boat and they have got to rebait those traps. They have got to keep their catch alive on the boat. They have got to get them back to the dock, and then they have got to get them to a processor and then to someone who is a dealer who packages these things and ships them all over the world.

Every time in this process, I fear, Mr. Chairman, there are fees, Federal, State, and maybe local fees, that are charged to get that critter from the bottom of the cold Maine ocean to the plate of hungry folks around the world.

So my bill, Mr. Chairman, that I am honored to bring up, my amendment to H.R. 200, requires NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, do something very common sense. We want to make sure we have an inventory of all the fees that are charged

to get this product to market, because our guys on the docks are coming up to me and our dealers and our processors, saying: Bruce, why are you making it so hard for us?

Government, Mr. Chairman, is supposed to make it easy for our families to live better lives and our small businesses, and all these lobster fishermen are running small businesses. We need to make sure their fees are lower and the regulations are fewer and the taxes are lower because that helps them grow their business, hire more people and pay them more, and live better lives with fatter paychecks and more freedom.

So I am asking everybody, Mr. Chairman—and I am grateful, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak about H.R. 200—I am asking every Republican and every Democrat in this Chamber to do what is right, which is to inventory these fees, because once we find out what I think are going to be one big boatload of fees, I am going to come back to this body and ask to get rid of those fees.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, we are not opposed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I wasn't going to rise in opposition until I heard about Maine and how beautiful and the free-running streams and all the tourists and the king crab and all those other things. I do admit, I have been to Maine, and I would agree with him, but his is just a little tiny one. We are a great big thing with bigger streams, bigger fish, bigger crab, but no lobsters, though.

I have no lobsters, and I am going to ask Mr. POLIQUIN why we haven't seen more lobsters from Maine. I am not sure why, but I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I know deep down in Mr. YOUNG's heart, he is a Mainer at heart. I know that. I have been to Alaska. It is a good State. Maine is a great State, and, as a result, I know Mr. YOUNG is going to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I didn't say I wouldn't support it. I just wanted to make sure I get my licks in for Alaska.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the amendment and will support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. ZELDIN. 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:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. —01. LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION ON ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS FISHING IN BLOCK ISLAND SOUND TRANSIT ZONE.

Any prohibition on fishing for Atlantic striped bass in the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States imposed under Executive Order 13449 or section 697.7(b) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, shall not apply in the the area described in section 697.7(b)(3) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, commonly referred to as the Block Island Sound transit zone.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 200 will provide needed regulatory relief for fishermen from the east end of Long Island and the entire region who are struggling under confusing and arbitrary Federal restrictions on striped bass fishing in the Block Island Sound.

The unique maritime geography of our region means that making the 15-mile journey by boat from Montauk Point, New York, to Block Island, Rhode Island, requires passing through a segment of waters considered to be part of the EEZ, known as the Block Island transit zone.

For recreational anglers, charter boat captains, and commercial fishermen, this shift in jurisdiction can mean the difference between a nice day on the water and committing a Federal offense. My amendment would permanently restore the right to fish for striped bass in this waterway, ending decades of confusion and arbitrary punishment for local fishermen.

These are hardworking men and women who run small businesses either on the commercial, charter, or recreational side, and in my district, they are the backbone of our coastal economy and part of our island's way of life. No other species of fish, besides striped bass, are subject to this confusing ban, which was meant to impact the high seas of the EEZ, not a small segment of local waters situated between two State boundaries. Fishermen should be able to legally fish for striped bass in this limited area just as they currently can in adjacent State waters.

We also must lift this unfair ban so that the resources of the U.S. Coast Guard can be focused on their important national security and safety mission, not waste it on the enforcement

of an arbitrary ban in a small waterway.

A recreational angler or boat captain on the water off of Montauk Point can easily go from fishing legally and responsibly in State waters to violating Federal law once they pass over the 3-mile limit where New York State waters end and the transit zone begins. Many of these individuals lack the expensive GPS technology to know if and when they have crossed the boundary, and there are no buoys to warn them.

These are responsible men and women who have the greatest vested interest in preserving the striped bass fishery, but they also desperately need relief from confusing government regulations that are hurting their livelihoods and access to local fisheries.

Last Congress, my stand-alone bill to address this issue, H.R. 3070, the EEZ Clarification Act, passed this House with a unanimous vote. I also passed two similar amendments on this topic through the House last September, again, with unanimous support.

This amendment is supported by the Recreational Fishing Alliance, Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, Montauk Boatman & Captains Association, and the newly formed New York Recreational & For-Hire Fishing Alliance.

On behalf of the hardworking men and women of Long Island who rely on fishing as a way of life, I ask for all my colleagues' support on this commonsense amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I do rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. This is an amendment that would lift the ban on striped bass fishing in the Block Island transit zone between Montauk, New York, and Block Island, Rhode Island.

Commercial and recreational fishing is allowed in State waters, as the gentleman said, from shore to 3 miles offshore. Striped bass is managed by the States from Maine through North Carolina through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Federal waters have been closed to striped bass fishing since 1990 when a moratorium went into effect to protect juvenile fish entering the spawning population and to help rebuild a fishery that was recovering from decades of overfishing.

There has been an ongoing effort to reopen the striped bass fishery in the transit zone, yet there is no science to justify it. In contrast, the science shows that allowing fishing in this transit zone, which encompasses about 155 square miles of habitat, could disproportionately impact spawning females and, thus, threaten the overall health of the striped bass stock.

This would be detrimental to some of the biggest recreational and commercial fishing ports on the East Coast. Opening up Federal waters in one region would undermine the protections and commitment to rebuilding that others along the coast have invested in. It would set a bad precedent in managing the striped bass fishery, which still has a long way to go.

Finally, Congress should not be legislating on species-specific fishery management actions. This issue is regularly assessed by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. We need to let that commission do its job and make decisions that are based on science.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no,” and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, this should not be treated as Federal waterways. It should be treated as a small local waterway in between two State boundaries. It shouldn't have been designated EEZ in the first place.

This amendment doesn't declare open season on striped bass fishing. It is still going to be subject to the same management that currently exists for surrounding waterways where striped bass fishing is currently acceptable.

The science shows biomass for the striped bass fisheries strong in our area, and, also, a science that is not discussed enough in this debate is the science of my fishermen and those small-business owners who are struggling to make ends meet.

So you have the science of the biomass being where it needs to be, plus we have the science that we are not speaking about enough where people right now are desperate for this kind of relief. They want people in Congress representing them in Washington who get it, who are going to fight for them.

We can't be lost in this beltway argument where, here, I am a Representative from the east end of Long Island, the First Congressional District of New York, and we have people who represent the other end of the United States of America telling us what is best for us.

We are here pleading for people to listen to us, to hear us, to hear from these fishermen, the commercial fishermen, the recreational fishermen, and to fight for them as well, especially when biomass backs it up.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, these certainly are arguments that can and should be made at the Atlantic Council. In fact, they are made regularly, and that council has representation regionally, has representation from all the key stakeholders, and has access to the best available science, the state-of-the-art science on this issue. So I think we need to let that council do its job, and, with that, I request a “no” vote.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I would say that every level of government needs to get it better than the way that we have the current laws, current rules, current regulations, whether it is the Federal Government, whether it is the regional councils, whether it is the State governments.

Earlier on, when we were having a debate on the underlying bill and I was talking about the fluke fishery for commercial fishermen, 50 pounds a day for 7 days, 350 pounds, you are not going to let them catch 350 pounds in 1 day. You will make them catch 50 pounds a day for 7 days, while the neighboring State of New Jersey could do 500 pounds a day for 3 days.

Well, guess what happened today. Talk about not getting it at other levels of government. Our Governor in New York State, out of no notice, cuts off the commercial food fishery. These people are struggling to make ends meet.

So instead of pointing fingers at other levels of government and regional councils where everyone is making mistakes and no one gets it, how about we do our part? How about we get it? How about we listen to them? we hear from them? we make a difference?

We are leaders. We are elected to represent our people. I am elected to represent my people, and I would respectfully urge my colleagues, especially those who are from faraway places several hundred miles away, to do a better job listening and allowing me to represent my folks and stop trying to undercut people who are hardworking business owners struggling to make ends meet, especially when science is on our side.

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

□ 1700

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ___—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
SEC. ___01. FUNDING FOR MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION OF NORTHEAST MULTISPECIES FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Section 311(f)(4) (16 U.S.C. 1861(f)(4)) is amended by striking “pursuant to this section” and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting “to enforce and monitor (including electronic monitoring) implementation of that Plan.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman

from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that will reduce the cost of monitoring on fishermen.

My amendment would allow the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, to spend the fees they collect from penalties that are assessed against violators of fisheries regulations to help defray the costs related to monitoring. Being able to use the fees in this way will actually help NOAA prevent against future violations, as well as possibly reduce the cost to fishermen themselves.

Currently, these fees can be used only to support NOAA enforcement actions. While enforcement is important, it unnecessarily prevents NOAA from spending these funds on preventing violations in the first place. Electronic monitoring and at-sea monitoring trips help to ensure that these kinds of abuses do not occur. This makes them a critical tool to NOAA in enforcing regulations and ensuring that our fisheries remain sustainable.

Countless fishermen in my district have been suffering this past year because a select few decided to abuse the system. Greater investments in monitoring may have helped prevent this massive fraud that occurred. However, now that it has, it is important that measures be put in place to prevent anything like this from ever happening again. That means funding for prevention and monitoring.

NOAA should be able to use the funds it collects from the recent cases and any other cases that inevitably arise to double down on protecting the sustainability of fisheries and preventing as much abuse as possible before the harm is ever done.

My amendment does just that by allowing NOAA to use the fees it collects to support prevention efforts. This gives NOAA and the fisheries managers greater flexibility to find the right balance between prevention and enforcement, and, at the same time, lowers the cost of monitoring for fishermen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. KEATING for his amendment. This is long overdue. Collecting those fees and using them for observer coverage is something that should be done.

If I go back to his first amendment, I want to mechanize it and use technology to make sure the fishermen have an opportunity to, I believe, report better.

This is a good amendment. I will be voting for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Alaska for his support. He knows full well how difficult it is, particularly in our region, for fishermen just to sustain themselves, let alone sustain the fish. We want to sustain the fishermen themselves. These small vessels are out there, and they are facing \$900-a-day monitoring charges. This is another means by which we will be able to do it.

So I find myself agreeing three times in the last few minutes with my colleague from Alaska—twice on my amendments and the other, indeed, on a prior amendment where he rightfully pointed out the rather hyperbolic description of the State of Maine, as wonderful as it is, and remind and agree with him that, indeed, this was just a mere portion of Massachusetts at one time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115-786.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, 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, add the following:

TITLE V—REEF ASSASSIN ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Reef Assassin Act".

SEC. 502. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 321. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue regulations under which a participating State may issue to an individual submitting lionfish taken in Federal or State waters a tag authorizing the taking of a fish of a covered species in Federal waters in addition to any other fish of that species the individual is authorized to take in Federal waters.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF TAG.—The regulations shall require—

"(1) the submission of 100 lionfish for each tag issued;

"(2) that lionfish taken in State waters must be taken by an individual holding a valid license to engage in such fishing issued under the laws of such State; and

"(3) that each lionfish shall be submitted by removing the tail, placing it in a resealable plastic bag, and submitting such bag to a participating State before the tail has significantly deteriorated.

"(c) NO LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TAGS.—The regulations shall not limit the number of tags that may be issued to an individual.

"(d) USE OF TAGS.—The regulations shall provide that a tag issued under the regulations—

"(1) shall be valid for the 5-year period beginning on the date it is issued;

"(2) shall authorize only the recreational or commercial taking of a fish that complies with any size limit that otherwise applies to fishing for such fish in the waters in which it is taken;

"(3) shall authorize such taking without regard to any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to the species of fish taken;

"(4) shall authorize—

"(A) the transfer of tags to any other person; and

"(B) use of transferred tags in the same manner as such tags may be used by the person to whom the tags were issued; and

"(5) shall require that any fish taken under such tag outside any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to such fish must have the tag fastened between the mouth and gill before being placed in any cooler.

"(e) APPROVAL OF STATE TO PARTICIPATE.—

"(1) CONDITIONS.—The regulations shall require that as a condition of approving a State to issue tags under this section the Secretary shall require the State to designate a repository for lionfish submitted for such tags.

"(2) PROVISION OF FREEZER.—The Secretary shall provide to each participating State freezers in which to store submitted lionfish, at a cost of not more than \$500 for each freezer.

"(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

"(1) encourage participating States to use existing infrastructure and staff or volunteers to conduct the State's program under this section;

"(2) include on the webpage of the National Marine Fisheries Service information about the program under this section; and

"(3) encourage State and local governments to work with retailers and distributors to advance the purchasing and consumption of lionfish.

"(g) OTHER PROVISIONS NOT AFFECTED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—This section—

"(A) is intended to protect species of fish that are native to waters of the United States or the exclusive economic zone; and

"(B) shall not be construed to constrain any fishery, fishing quota, or fishing allocation.

"(2) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF TAGS.—This section and tags issued or authorized to be issued under this section shall not be considered in any determination of fishing levels, quotas, or allocations.

"(h) DEFINITION.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'covered fish'—

"(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means red snapper, gag grouper, triggerfish, amberjack; and

"(B) does not include any species included in a list of endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

"(2) the term 'participating State' means a State that has applied and been approved by the Secretary to issue tags under regulations under this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

"Sec. 301. Encouraging elimination of lionfish."

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 965, the gentleman

from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED

BY MR. GAETZ

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified version of my amendment at the desk be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GAETZ:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—REEF ASSASSIN ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Reef Assassin Act".

SEC. 502. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state. Title III of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 321. ENCOURAGING ELIMINATION OF LIONFISH.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state, the Secretary shall issue regulations under which a participating State may issue to an individual submitting lionfish taken in Federal or State waters a tag authorizing the taking of a fish of a covered species in Federal waters in addition to any other fish of that species the individual is authorized to take in Federal waters.

"(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF TAG.—The regulations shall require—

"(1) the submission of 100 lionfish for each tag issued;

"(2) that lionfish taken in State waters must be taken by an individual holding a valid license to engage in such fishing issued under the laws of such State; and

"(3) that each lionfish shall be submitted by removing the tail, placing it in a resealable plastic bag, and submitting such bag to a participating State before the tail has significantly deteriorated.

"(c) NO LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TAGS.—The regulations shall not limit the number of tags that may be issued to an individual.

"(d) USE OF TAGS.—The regulations shall provide that a tag issued under the regulations—

"(1) shall be valid for the 5-year period beginning on the date it is issued;

"(2) shall authorize only the recreational or commercial taking of a fish that complies with any size limit that otherwise applies to fishing for such fish in the waters in which it is taken;

"(3) shall authorize such taking without regard to any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to the species of fish taken;

"(4) shall authorize—

"(A) the transfer of tags to any other person; and

"(B) use of transferred tags in the same manner as such tags may be used by the person to whom the tags were issued;

"(5) shall require that any fish taken under such tag outside any seasonal limitation that otherwise applies to such fish must have the tag fastened between the mouth and gill before being placed in any cooler; and

"(6) shall only be utilized for species caught in the same water adjacent a state where the lionfish were originally caught.

“(e) APPROVAL OF STATE TO PARTICIPATE.—“(1) CONDITIONS.—The regulations shall require that as a condition of approving a State to issue tags under this section the Secretary shall require the State to designate a repository for lionfish submitted for such tags.

“(2) PROVISION OF FREEZER.—The Secretary shall provide to each participating State freezers in which to store submitted lionfish, at a cost of not more than \$500 for each freezer.

“(f) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) encourage participating States to use existing infrastructure and staff or volunteers to conduct the State’s program under this section;

“(2) include on the webpage of the National Marine Fisheries Service information about the program under this section; and

“(3) encourage State and local governments to work with retailers and distributors to advance the purchasing and consumption of lionfish.

“(g) OTHER PROVISIONS NOT AFFECTED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section—

“(A) is intended to protect species of fish that are native to waters of the United States or the exclusive economic zone; and

“(B) shall not be construed to constrain any fishery, fishing quota, or fishing allocation.

“(2) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF TAGS.—This section and tags issued or authorized to be issued under this section shall not be considered in any determination of fishing levels, quotas, or allocations.

“(h) DEFINITION.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘covered fish’—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means red snapper, gag grouper, triggerfish, amberjack; and

“(B) does not include any species included in a list of endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

“(2) the term ‘participating State’ means a State that has applied and been approved by the Secretary to issue tags under regulations under this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

“Sec. 301. Encouraging elimination of lionfish.”

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue regulations under the amendment made by subsection (a) by not later than 60 days after the approval of an exempted fishing permit submitted by a participating state.

(d) RESTRICTION.—Nothing in section 321 shall be construed as to allow for the transfer of fisheries allocation or catch among the various states.

Mr. GAETZ (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment contains the relevant provisions of the Reef Assassin Act, which would attack the lionfish problem that is very pervasive in the warm waters of

the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

Lionfish are an invasive species that are decimating our reef fish. One lionfish can consume up to 65 juvenile reef fish in one sitting. A female lionfish can release up to as many as 10 million eggs over the course of one lifetime.

This legislation would allow our resources to be used to protect our resource by creating an incentive for fishers who harvest the lionfish and then turn them in to participating States that would choose, on a volunteer program, to be able to issue tags for one prized, coveted reef fish—a triggerfish, a gag grouper, or a red snapper—in the event that 100 lionfish tails were produced. Anyone who goes and slays 100 lionfish certainly has saved far more than one of our prized reef fish.

That is why it is my belief that this amendment makes a great deal of sense for our environment and also for the overall health of our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), the Democrat lead on the Reef Assassin Act.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this good, bipartisan amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Lionfish are disrupting Florida’s natural ecosystem. Lionfish are taking away prey from our native fish stocks and prey on reef fish that perform essential ecological services on the reefs.

This amendment would give an incentive for fishermen to remove the lionfish by awarding a tag for desired reef fish in return for every 100 lionfish tails turned in. That is quite the bounty.

The amendment will promote cooperation between local, State, and Federal governments to eradicate lionfish from Florida waters.

This amendment is derived from a bill of which I am a cosponsor.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, although I don’t intend to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for bringing this issue up.

The lionfish has certainly, according to many reports, been a species that is causing an adverse impact to red snapper. The solution that he proposes here is a solution whereby States could submit a modified or a new exempted fisheries permit, where they could provide for additional access, on top of their existing allocation, to red snapper in

exchange for harvesting a certain number of lionfish species, which are predators to the red snapper.

As folks will see, there is a lot of handwriting on this amendment. We did sit back and make some changes to this, so there is an excellent chance that there are some imperfections here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for working with us on this. I thank my friends from Florida and California for working with us on this as well. It is likely that we are going to need some additional work on this as we move forward. There are some enforcement issues; there are science issues; and there is introduction of a new mechanism that causes some significant concern in the form of tags, in some cases.

But I, again, thank the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue, for working to ensure that we continue to have access to red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. I look forward to working with my friend from Florida, as well as the folks across the aisle, in perfecting this as we move through the conference committee.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for offering his insight and his views. It is certainly my hope that any animal that is delicious, like the lionfish, but that is also invasive and destructive to our environment, would be one that we would be able to work together across the aisle to harvest out of existence, so that we protect our environment and protect our coveted reef fish.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, 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. H.R. 200) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 965, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was 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

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOMEZ. I am opposed in its current form.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gomez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 200 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 49, line 22, strike “and”.

Page 50, line 4, strike the second period and insert “; and”.

Page 50, after line 4, insert the following:

(4) in clause (ii) of paragraph (1)(A), as amended by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section—

(A) by inserting “(I)” before “regulatory restrictions”; and

(B) by inserting “or (II) unilateral tariffs imposed by other countries on any United States seafood exports or unilateral tariffs imposed by any country on materials necessary for the economic viability of the United States’ fishing industry” after “environment”.

Mr. GOMEZ (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1715

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

If adopted, the bill would immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump claims his trade policy is meant to level the playing field for the United States, but workers and businesses in other parts of the economy will suffer unintended consequences.

Despite his claims to pursue a trade agenda that will put American workers first, this administration’s trade policy shows a lack of strategy and planning that risks putting working families last and threatens our economy.

Any trade agenda must fix the problems with existing policy rather than

making matters worse. Escalating tariffs and alienating our closest trading partners does nothing to advance a trade agenda that puts working families first.

Our trade policy should prioritize strong environmental protections, penalize cheaters, enforce labor protections for workers, and strengthen rules of origin so we can advance a trade agenda that is fair to every American worker instead of picking winners and losers.

But President Trump isn’t known for his discretion or his deep knowledge of policy. He doesn’t realize or doesn’t care that his America First trade agenda puts America last by undermining our competitiveness and innovation. The idea of unintended consequences didn’t even cross his mind when announcing these unilateral tariffs.

But as Members of Congress representing constituents from around the country, we know that there are very real consequences for these actions.

That is why I am offering this motion to recommit, which would allow a Governor or elected official or appointed official to request that the Secretary of Commerce declare a fishery disaster if fishermen suffer negative impacts from these tariffs.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act restored dozens of fishery stocks to healthy levels, and we cannot allow the ill-conceived or half-baked ideas of the President to hurt the workers or the progress we have actually made.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The parliamentarian, I think, made a mistake, but they have a right to do that, as others Members do, but that is the way it goes.

Mr. Speaker, let’s not kid ourselves. If you listen to the presentation, it has nothing to do with a fish bill. This is a procedural trick to delay passage of this bipartisan legislation. And I keep saying this is a fish bill that has been in existence for many years, since 1976, and it has been a success, and then we come up with a recommit motion that has nothing to do with this bill.

The prize is fish communities, sustainable yields, domestic seafood industry, and a job creation bill.

With all due respect, I strongly urge a rejection of the motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GOMEZ. 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 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 228, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

YEAS—187

Adams	Galleo	Nadler
Aguilar	Garamendi	Neal
Barragán	Gomez	Nolan
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beatty	Gottheimer	O’Halloran
Bera	Green, Al	O’Rourke
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Panetta
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Payne
Bonamici	Heck	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peters
F.	Himes	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Bustos	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jones	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rosen
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kihuen	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Cohen	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sinema
Cuellar	Levin	Sires
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Suozi
DeFazio	Loebsock	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Takano
Delaney	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Titus
Demings	M.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Deutch	Lynch	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney,	Vargas
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Sean	Vela
F.	Matsui	Velázquez
Engel	McCollum	Visclosky
Eshoo	McEachin	Walz
Españat	McGovern	Wasserman
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Schultz
Evans	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Welch
Fudge	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth

NAYS—228

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barletta	Black
Allen	Barr	Bost
Amash	Barton	Brady (TX)
Amodei	Bergman	Brat
Arrington	Biggs	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan

Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill, including the change I have placed on the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 15, strike “including”

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6237, MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–815) on the resolution (H. Res. 989) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NATHANIEL “NAT” REED

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nathaniel “Nat” Reed of Jupiter Island, a Florida environmental icon who died today at the age of 84.

Mr. Reed loved nature and the Florida environment and devoted most of his life to fighting for Florida’s natural wonders like the Everglades. My finest memory of him will be hunting quail near Hobe Sound.

As an aide to former Governor Claude Kirk, Mr. Reed successfully stopped the construction of an airport in the Florida Everglades because the construction would have meant devastation to the Everglades and Big Cypress Swamp.

Mr. Reed appreciated wildlife and was also one of the authors of the Endangered Species Act, which protects many animals, including several in Florida. He later ended up founding 1000 Friends of Florida, to preserve special places in our State.

Nat Reed is an institution in the State of Florida, and he was a wonderful mentor to me. Our State lost a real leader and a friend to many, and he will be greatly missed.

FAILURE TO ACT HAS CONSEQUENCES

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems that the United States moves from one crisis to the next. We have to keep our eye on the ball.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect everyone in this country from unnecessary suffering. We cannot forget that the Trump administration is still holding children in cages, “Cages ‘R’ Us.”

Congress should step up and end this terrible policy. We cannot forget that thousands—maybe even millions—of people in this country are served by water systems that violate the Safe Water Drinking Act. Congress should invest in rebuilding community water infrastructures.

We cannot forget that this year there is nearly one school shooting a week. Congress needs to dump the NRA and pass reasonable gun laws.

Mr. Speaker, ignoring the problem doesn’t make it go away, and each moment we fail to act puts human lives at risk.

□ 1800

HONORING PHILIP W. HOLMES, JR.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one of my hometown’s finest. The founder and owner of Rock Hill, South Carolina’s iconic PW’s Ice Cream, Mr. Philip W. Holmes, Jr. has passed away at the age of 82.

For 25 years, PW’s has served our community proudly. Following his service in the Marine Corps and his experience in the hospitality industry, Mr. Holmes took the risk every business owner does and opened PW’s in 1993. It was named after his two sons, Philip III and Wayne. He believed that ice cream was one of the greatest ways to bring families together.

After his passing, both of his sons continue his legacy at PW’s. You can now find the phrase, “Dad got his wings” on the store’s sign.

Philip Holmes, Jr. will be remembered by our community for giving every scoop with a smile. He was a great South Carolinian, and he was a great American.

NATO

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is important for my colleagues and as well the American people to know that NATO is not just section 5, when one is attacked all are attacked. NATO is thought. It is purpose. It is a sense of collaborative viewpoints on the value of democracy.

It is important that any Commander in Chief, no matter what party affili-

ation, passes the standard of decorum to recognize our allies and to strengthen the relationships and to give criticism where necessary and to seek improvement, but not to be an embarrassment.

I think it is important, as meetings are proceeding, that we recognize that our allies are far more important than an individual who continues to provide nerve gas to kill people on foreign soil, to be behind attacks on airplanes taking over Crimea and other places. It is important to recognize that, yes, you engage with your enemy, but you recognize that they are your enemy.

I would also suggest that it is hardly the American way for the U.S. delegation to oppose a breastfeeding resolution at the World Health Organization and to punish a little country like Ecuador.

I want us to be better internationally, Mr. Speaker, and stand for the values of America.

JULIA RUELLE AND THE BOUNDARY WATERS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, last year, 16-year-old Julia Ruelle of Minnetonka, Minnesota, started having headaches and exhaustion. A sophomore at Minnetonka High School, she was diagnosed with a very rare brain tumor.

Julia grew up loving the outdoors, and as she began her treatment, she would often think about the Boundary Waters Canoe Area where her family vacationed for years.

Today, Julia is recovering and is back to outdoor physical activity. She recently won an essay contest on why the Boundary Waters are so important and why it matters to her—winning a prize of a parent-free weekend canoeing in the Boundary Waters wilderness.

Julia, looking strong and healthy, just visited my office last month to advocate for protecting the Boundary Waters. She is a brave girl, and she is a perfect example of what this national treasure means to Minnesota and what it means to our country.

I include in the RECORD a copy of her essay.

2018 BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA ESSAY CONTEST

(Winning Essay by Julia Ruelle, Minnetonka, Minn.)

It’s the start of the school year: everyone is sullen for being forced to sit still all day and teachers try in vain to pull us out of our school-induced slumber with a myriad of get-to-know-you activities. As I fill out yet another form with questions I am tired of answering, I come to the question asking me to list my favorite activities. I pause for a moment, wondering which activities to include this time: running, cross country skiing, downhill skiing, sledding, ice skating, kayaking, canoeing, paddle boarding, camping, gardening, walking, hiking, biking, hammocking, or exploring. As a shortcut and

with a melancholy glance at the sun shining through the window, I settle with writing, “being outside”.

Though such get-to-know-you forms are rarely very honest, one fact always holds true to me: I love being outside. In the summer, a typical day usually starts with running with the cross country team as the sun rises, paddling with a friend in the afternoon, and an evening walk with Rio, our faithful seven year old rescue dog, around a small lake of the over 10,000 our state is known for. For the past 5 years, Rio and my family have been lucky to have a change in scenery to the beautiful, pristine Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for about four days each summer. These days are when I feel most connected to my soul and surroundings and most at home, with no social media or material concerns to distract me from the purity of the air in my lungs, dirt beneath my feet, and the sounds of birds, water, and all things natural in my ears. My love for these lands has caused me to be involved with the Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters movement, regularly donating and wearing the logo on shirts, stickers, and pins as frequently as possible. All my classmates know of this passion of mine, as I take any opportunity to educate my peers about the threat the proposed Twin Metals mine poses to the pristine waters so unique to the Boundary Waters and the many watersheds it affects.

Though Jerry Vandiver, a country singer with an album or two about the Boundary Waters area, sings that “winter is for . . . pull[ing] out the map” and “plan[ning] a new route” while keeping close to the warmth of the fireplace, to me, the snow and sub-zero temperatures of Minnesota winters make venturing outside even more exciting! I joined the cross country ski team last year and immediately regretted not having tried it earlier. Skiing taught me to love winter and pray for more snow, instead of begrudging it. Though I grew up loving to ice skate at the park across the street, learning to ski ignited a desire to be outside everyday, even when the cold was biting.

Unfortunately, this winter has been a little different. Around Thanksgiving, I started experiencing exhaustion, headaches, and nausea at rates I had never before had to withstand. As doctors didn’t perceive any viruses to be concerned about, we wrote it off as migraines and I continued to participate in life as usual, going to school and ski practices everyday. However, after trying to fight through it for two weeks, I ended up in Urgent Care one night and scheduled an appointment with my doctor three days later. During those three days, I slept pretty much all day and barely ate, thanks to debilitating headaches and nausea. Arriving at the doctor’s appointment, I threw up in the waiting room and the nurses deemed my low body temperature and slow heart rate alarming enough to rush me to the emergency room in an ambulance. At the end of that day, they still didn’t have any answers as to what was causing it all. However, the next day, my doctor suggested getting an MRI and I squeezed into their last slot of the day. Halfway through the MRI, my parents were rushed into a special room and my doctors got in contact with the radiologist and a neurologist. All in all, the verdict was that there was a mass in my brain causing pressure build up, also known as hydrocephalus. I required an endoscopic third ventriculostomy, which is essentially a tube put into my head to allow the fluids to flow, and a biopsy to find out what it was. So there I was, getting brain surgery, which is definitely not the curveball most expect during sophomore year. The biopsy revealed that I had a rare brain tumor called a

germinoma, luckily with a high cure rate. Obviously, this has changed my life completely and kept me from doing most normal teen things. But, the worst part was not being allowed to run, ski, skate, or do anything that had the potential of making me fall until the surgeons deemed me ready. Still, I made it my priority to be outside at least once a day, usually taking short walks. Getting outside even when I felt unable to do most other things has been a type of therapy for me. Breathing fresh air and feeling the cold on my face refreshed me and made me feel better, at least for a little while, every time.

After six weeks of limited activity, the Friday I got the OK to do any activity I wished began the best weekend since the diagnosis. In the afternoon, I went snowshoeing on a trail through the cattails. At night, I ice skated with friends. The next morning, I cross country skied on a frozen creek. On Sunday, I ran for the first time since the diagnosis and though it was incredibly slow-paced, the feeling of fighting through the burn and completing an entire loop of my go-to trail can only be understood by those who have experienced the phenomenon of a runner’s high. Better yet was the soreness that almost kept me from making it down the stairs Monday morning. I had been sore many times due to the chemotherapy, but this pain was something I had caused myself by working hard and, in a weird way, made me very proud of myself.

Reading the announcement of this essay contest in the paper this Thursday, I could hardly withhold my excitement! I danced around the house, imagining the essay I would write and how much fun it would be to share my favorite place with my friends. Though I am such a lover of the BWCA, most of my friends have never experienced its hypnotic serenity and I’ve always wanted to share it with them, but not wanted to have to bring my parents along. This contest has the potential of granting me this wish. In addition, I am lucky to have a short treatment plan of chemotherapy and radiation that will be wrapped up in early May with no physical restrictions. This enables me to be perfectly ready for a summer trip to the greatest place on Earth with my closest friends.

As I reviewed the details of the contest, I found something additional that links me to this mission: Joseph [one of the contest judges]. Hi! I read that you were diagnosed with leukemia at 13 years old and I imagine you and I share many similar experiences. Other than just the typical cancer similarities, I wonder if you share the experience of growing a little sick of your parents. I know, it might seem impossible to them, but after being surrounded and worried about almost exclusively by my parents for the last couple months, I’m very ready to escape their concern for a little while. Of course, I have always and will always love and appreciate them for their constant love and support, but distance makes the heart grow fonder, right? My desire to spend a couple days deep in the wilderness, sharing unique experiences with my closest friends, has increased greatly in the last couple months.

As a long-time lover of the outdoors and the Boundary Waters and a recent parent-escape hopeful, I would cherish this opportunity to navigate the lakes and portages I’m so fond of with my friends. I know my dreams will soon be filled with mornings looking out over the water, long days of paddling, dinners laughing beside the campfire, and nights sleeping with only a tent between me and a sky full of stars. I pray these dreams will be made a reality.

NATO

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House passed a resolution which I authored with the help of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of which ED ROYCE is the chairman supporting NATO and the NATO countries that are endangered by Russian aggression, particularly Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and the Baltic area. The Balkan countries also have been threatened, including Montenegro, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.

The resolution speaks of our support of the sanctions against Russia. And the sanctions should remain until Crimea is returned to Ukraine and the Donbas no longer has war. Then we continue to support the Baltics who have their airspace invaded by Russian aggression.

I am pleased that Speaker RYAN allowed this resolution to come to the floor and was passed by voice vote unanimous consent as the Senate had passed a similar resolution 97-2. The House and the Senate stand together in support of NATO and our allies in Eastern, Central, and Western Europe.

HONORING FORMER MAYOR JIMMY DELOACH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember someone who dedicated his life to public service in the First Congressional District of Georgia, Mr. James Mondell DeLoach, Sr., who passed away on July 3 at the age of 86.

Jimmy DeLoach truly dedicated his whole life to serving others. He was a staple of government in Garden City, Georgia, between 1970 and 1990, serving three terms as the mayor of Garden City and then for 8 more years as a Chatham County commissioner.

As county commissioner, Mr. DeLoach was integral in the construction of the nationally important Mighty Eighth Air Force Heritage Museum dedicated to the airmen who served in the European theater during World War II.

Because of his exceptional service to the area, one of the area’s most popular roadways was given his name, the Jimmy DeLoach Parkway.

Jimmy DeLoach was the epitome of a public servant. And he set the bar high for all of us who followed him in public service.

His family, including his son, the mayor of Savannah, Eddie DeLoach, are all in my thoughts and prayers. We truly lost a giant in west Chatham County.

NATO

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 70 years now, the United States has led the Western alliance standing up to first the Soviet Union and then Russia within the organization known as NATO.

Whether the President of the United States was Democrat or Republican, Truman, Kennedy, Reagan, Bush, Obama, it made no difference. Standing up and supporting our Western European allies, standing up and supporting NATO was an absolute given and, frankly, not even a partisan issue. Yet under this President and this administration, we now have, for the first time ever in the post-World War II era, a real question about American commitment to NATO and to the Western alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Trump administration to follow the bipartisan lead of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to support NATO and support our Western allies. It has underpinned peace for 70 years.

HONORING NEW YORK STATE
TROOPER NICHOLAS CLARK

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of New York State Trooper Nicholas Clark. A lifelong resident of Steuben County and a star football player from my alma mater, Alfred University, Nick Clark honorably served his community and the State of New York as a New York State trooper. Since 2015, he has protected the people that he called his friends and neighbors.

Trooper Clark put his life on the line every day to serve his community. In the early morning of Monday, July 2, 2018, Trooper Clark responded to a call in the town of Erwin and was shot and killed in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, he is truly a hero for his actions and the sacrifices he made for all of us. Trooper Clark will be missed by the communities that he served and the lives that he touched. Together we stand with his family and friends as they mourn.

I thank him for his service to our community and for his bravery. I pray he rests in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this legislative body to pause its deliberations and join me in remembering and honoring the 29-year life of Trooper Nicholas Clark.

REUNITE CHILDREN WITH FAMILIES:
WE WILL NOT STOP UNTIL
EACH CHILD IS WITH THEIR
PARENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject matter of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to address this body, once again, on the urgency of reuniting migrant children with their families.

The administration's zero-tolerance policy has caused chaos and systematically torn immigrant children away from their parents. Many innocent children are still being held under inhumane conditions at detention facilities apart from their parents. In total, almost 5,000 children—let me repeat—almost 5,000 children who have been separated from their parents because of this zero-tolerance policy are still suffering.

Last month, U.S. District Judge Sabraw ruled that children under the age of 5 must be reunited with their parents within 14 days. That deadline was yesterday. It came and passed, and only about half the children were actually reunited.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. There needs to be consequences for the administration's disregard for the law and failure to comply with the Federal Court order.

The United Nations has noted that children who arrive at the U.S. border who plead for asylum with their parents is a legal form of entry according to international law. Many of these children are fleeing from countries plagued with gang violence and drug wars. The administration continues to highlight the threat of the MS-13. Yet the administration does not acknowledge that actually MS-13 is one of the reasons why children and families are seeking protection in our country.

Asylum seekers are not illegal immigrants. They are individuals seeking refuge. It is the law to ensure that asylum seekers are given an opportunity to state their case in front of a judge. Furthermore, separating children away from their parents is an illegal violation of human rights.

This violation of human rights is being exacerbated by DHS' poor record-keeping. Today the administration does not have the recordkeeping capability necessary to reunite children with their parents, and, instead, they are now relying on DNA tests to figure out what child belongs to what parent.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, 120 of my colleagues and I have called upon the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services and Homeland Security to investigate on how

the administration plans to reunite children with their families. We are concerned that there are no records of the children to reconnect them with their proper parents.

The administration's actions are causing irreparable harm to these vulnerable children, and it is time for the administration to immediately reunite these families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), who is my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CORREA for this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has just missed their court deadline for reuniting the youngest children separated from their parents, and there seems to be no solution in sight for these innocent children.

Over 20 days ago, even before the court order, I led my colleagues in writing a letter to Homeland Security and Health and Human Services asking what their plans were for reuniting separated children with their families.

□ 1815

I have yet to get an answer. The American people deserve to know where the children are and how they will be safely returned to their families.

In a world where we can track nearly everything in real time, how is a Federal agency unable to provide answers to Congress on the whereabouts of kids in their care?

We are told that agencies did not coordinate their efforts. Did they not plan for this? Do they not understand the concept of interoperability that we have come to use within our administrations?

This administration's cruel policies are overwhelming our already burdened judicial and foster care systems, and the American people are stuck paying the price. It is time for this administration to realize that policy decisions have consequences.

Even the few children who have been reunited with their families will carry the scars of this appalling experience throughout their lives. We have already heard reports that some of the youngest do not recognize their parents as they are reunited. That is understandable. In fact, it is even anticipated. Families, as we are seeing, are traumatized. They are scared. They are heartbroken, as anybody would be in their shoes.

Mr. Speaker, I once again call on this administration to answer critical questions about the whereabouts of the children and reunite them with their families immediately.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, Mr. SALUD CARBAJAL, my good friend and colleague.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am an immigrant to this country.

What has become evident is the cruel, self-imposed crisis that this administration has created. It has created a chaotic process for detaining and separating children from their families.

This is an administration that has now missed the court's order to start reuniting children, something that is unacceptable. We are talking about more than 2,000 children, kids that remain separated from their families.

About a week ago, I visited the El Tornillo detention center in Texas. I saw firsthand the conditions in which these children are being detained. I spoke to the children firsthand to get their own personal thoughts on what was going on.

They talked to me in detail about how they were woken up at 5 a.m. in a regimented fashion. They were rushed through showers and made to take showers in less than 5 minutes. They were given only 10 to 15 minutes once or twice a day for recreation, because they are out in the middle of the desert where it is extremely, extremely hot.

This administration has said that they are on track to reunite children with their families, but there is no clear plan. There are no details. There is a Department of Homeland Security four-point plan to nowhere that has been put forth. In this plan, there are no details. There is really an absence of a coherent process that will reunite these children with their families. This is unacceptable.

This is a self-imposed crisis and a cruel crisis that has been created by this administration. This is why we need a congressional hearing and oversight to get to the bottom of this and to really show the American people how misguided this policy has been and the inhumane conditions that have resulted from this policy.

America was once that beacon on the hill other countries looked to, in terms of how we treated our immigrants and those seeking shelter and asylum. We have lost that moral ground, because this administration has sought to destroy the values and ideals that our country has held up high for decades and centuries.

We also need legislation because, clearly, this administration reminded us that their zero-tolerance policy could be put in effect and implemented any other day again.

What this administration has done is un-American. This President has chosen to divide us again as a country, to go after the most vulnerable, and to go after immigrants in the most inhumane way. This is not the United States that we all love and care for.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, Congressman CORREA, for leading this important discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate my alarm about the child abuse at the border.

Due either to complete incompetence, deliberate indifference, or both, this administration failed to fully comply with one of the first court-ordered deadlines to reunite innocent children with their parents from whom they were separated.

The Trump administration failed to implement an effective system for identifying and reconnecting children with their parents before executing its family separation policy. As a result, they have been unable to accurately report the number of children in their custody, the location of each child, and the immigration status of the parents, many of whom who have already been deported.

Adding insult to injury, it was recently revealed that one of the detained children under the age of 5 may actually be an American citizen. Such a mistake should never happen and should shock every American to their core.

This is a despicable humanitarian crisis created by Donald Trump, and one which the Trump administration has shown no ability to solve.

Despite the President's attempt to divert attention from the crisis, thousands of children remain separated from their families. This is a national disgrace. Every parent, every grandparent, and every patriotic American should be appalled by the harm that this President has inflicted on children.

We must all exercise our First Amendment right to speak out against this unconscionable family separation crisis. I urge my colleagues in Congress to make every effort to ensure that these children are reconnected with their parents. If the crisis proves impossible for the administration to fully solve, Congress must hold accountable those who are responsible.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell my fellow Americans and fellow Members of Congress that I am appalled over reports of mistreatment and abuse toward children at the Shiloh Residential Treatment Center.

The facility is under contract with the Department of Health and Human Services, and is located just south of Houston, Texas. The Shiloh facility is owned and operated by the same entity that formerly operated Daystar Treatment Center in Manvel, Texas. Daystar was closed because the way they physically restrained children led to the death of three teenagers. In most cases, the children were hog-tied. Now, instead of hog-tied, they are drugging children into submission.

One child was prescribed 10 different shots and pills, including the antipsychotic drugs Latuda, Geodon, and Olanzapine; the Parkinson's medi-

cation Benzotropine; the seizure medication Clonazepam; and many, many others, such as nerve and pain medications, antidepressants, and cognitive enhancers. This is a crime.

A Federal judge in California, Judge Laughrey, recently explained: "Psychotropic drugs are powerful medications that directly affect the central nervous system. They are particularly potent when administered to children. . . . They are more vulnerable to psychosis, seizures, irreversible movement disorders, suicidal thoughts, aggression, weight gain, organ damage, and other life-threatening conditions."

The message is clear. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services needs to be reprimanded for letting these horrific actions take place, and provide answers to the American people. You cannot hide behind subcontractors. You are on notice.

Let me make this even clearer. The Federal Government must act at once. Stop placing these children in traumatic and dangerous environments that right now are causing children to suffer in pain.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in this argument, utilize their powers of congressional oversight, and call on the administration to end these procedures and abide by simple rules of decency and humanity.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of California (Mr. CORREA), for yielding and for his leadership on this very important humanitarian issue and so many other issues before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Trump administration missed its court-ordered deadline to reunite the toddlers and babies it kidnapped at our southern border with their families.

And, yes, I say kidnapped. I don't know how else to describe this. That is the only appropriate word to describe the implementation of the so-called zero-tolerance policy when there was clearly no forethought as to how children would be returned to their parents.

The cruelty and inhumanity at the border has led to nearly 3,000 children being torn away from their families and imprisoned. Instead of having a plan in place to reunite these families, the administration lost, destroyed, or never even created records, and clearly did not care or think about reuniting these children.

Now we have a crisis of a whole different kind: figuring out how we put the pieces back together, how we put the families together again. Some parents of these children have already been deported. Some are totally unaccounted for.

President Trump and his administration are utterly failing to fix this tragedy that they created. We have so

many tragedies in the world that we are reacting to. This was one that was literally created by this administration.

While we deal with this unorganized chaos and incompetence, the children still in custody continue to suffer irreparable trauma in unimaginable conditions, all because the President wanted to punish those who sought safety for their children and a better life in the United States of America.

We will not rest until each one of these children is back safely in their parents' arms. We will continue to demand information on how these children will be reunited with their families and insist that officials who took part in this tragedy are held accountable.

I have visited two facilities with my colleagues. One was in Elizabeth, New Jersey. We went there on Father's Day with permission from lawyers and the inmates to visit with them. At first, they would not allow us access. Finally, after we pushed and pushed, we were allowed to see five gentlemen, four of whom entered the country legally. They entered the country and immediately turned themselves over to immigration authorities. One came in illegally because there was violence at the border, and he then immediately turned himself over to immigration facilities.

They all had very sad stories to tell. I share one from a man, from which country, we can't say, but there was a lot of violence and drug violence. His partner was killed, and his business was destroyed. They went to the school, threatening to take his daughter. She, luckily, was not in school at the time. The thugs were looking for her.

So he grabbed his daughter and fled to America. He was in detention when they came to his cell at 3 o'clock in the morning and tore his 8-year-old daughter from his arms.

Along with my five colleagues, Members of Congress from New York and New Jersey, we asked to speak to the head of the facility, the head representing ICE, the head of the detention facility.

□ 1830

They said they had no records of where his daughter was. To this day, they have not reunited this father with his 8-year-old daughter. He broke down in tears.

I also visited a facility in New York City, Cayuga in East Harlem. This is a facility that I feel was very well-run. It is for foster care. Children are there in the daytime, and then they are placed in foster homes during the night.

Again, the children did not know where their parents were. The professionals said it usually takes them 59 days to find a relative, an appropriate guardian, or the parents.

I just have to join my colleagues in saying that this is a disaster. Mr. Speaker, 3,000 migrant children who

were taken from their parents at the border are still waiting to be reunited.

There are accounts of pregnant women being shackled in detention and callously denied prenatal care or medical attention when they are clearly experiencing symptoms of miscarriage.

On Tuesday, the administration missed the court-ordered deadline to reunite all children under 5 years of age. I understand there are more than, roughly, 100 children in this category. Very few have been reunited.

Neither HHS nor DHS have consistent answers about how and when any of these children under 5, or over 5, are going to be returned to their parents. In short, there is no plan.

There was no planning. They took children from the arms of their parents and did not keep records on where they are now.

Repeatedly, I have joined with Ranking Member ELIJAH CUMMINGS in calling for hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Despite numerous, numerous requests from him and others, we have not had one single hearing about this humanitarian crisis being put forth by our own government. Yet, there is a hearing planned tomorrow on Hillary Clinton's emails.

The election is over. Let's focus on the crisis before us: these children.

Again, we will keep calling for and asking for hearings on this crisis before our country.

I want to thank my colleague for working so hard and trying to find answers. I support his work completely, and I will continue working with him and others to reunite these families who came to our country looking for a better life.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, just recently, a 14-month-old baby boy was reunited with his mother. The baby boy was traumatized after being separated for almost 90 days from his loving mother. Not only did he look like he wasn't bathed for that time, but he also was covered with lice.

His mom said that her son was not the same since they were reunited. He hasn't been the same since they have been separated. He cries for fear of being alone. Her son is afraid of losing his mother again.

Another parent, Milka Pablo, received a different response from her 3-year-old daughter, Darly, when they were reunited in Phoenix after 4 months of being separated. Let me repeat: after being separated for 4 months, Darly did not recognize her mother.

Milka was met with cries of rejection, and Darly, the daughter, screamed as she tried to wiggle away from her mother's arms.

I cannot believe these small children are subjected to such conditions. Mr. Speaker, some are as young as 1 year old. One of these individuals—a 1-year-

old—was obligated to appear in front of a judge for deportation proceedings while separated from his parents.

These children don't have the rights to a court-appointed attorney and are clearly frightened, yet they are still forced—a 1-year-old—to appear in front of a judge and answer questions that, clearly, they cannot comprehend.

Many of these children can barely form sentences, yet they are expected to talk about the violence-plagued countries they are fleeing.

Even Judge John Richardson told a lawyer representing a 1-year-old that he was embarrassed to ask a baby questions on whether they understood the immigration proceedings before them.

The separation of immigrant children from their parents is unconstitutional and simply wrong. I demand that all families be reunited immediately.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, contemporary deportation policies are traumatizing families. The inhumane policy of separating families is terrorizing parents to detrimental ends. Currently, more than 1,300 families are going through unnecessary and harmful separation enacted under our current administration.

Last month, Mr. Munoz and his family crossed the border to apply for asylum. For 40-year-old Marco Antonio Munoz, the fear and anxiety became overwhelming. After being separated from his wife and 3-year-old son, Mr. Munoz strangled himself in a detention center in Texas. His suicide shows the fear they felt during the border crossing and on the road to safety in the U.S.

The law allows families to escape violence and prosecution by seeking shelter in the United States. Currently, the administration refers to asylum as a loophole and family separation as part of a zero-tolerance policy. This policy of zero tolerance is designed to deter and punish immigrants seeking asylum, making them illegal.

While we should all focus on the negative effects on the children, we can't forget the negative effects on the parents as well. Families that present themselves to border agents seeking asylum have not violated any laws. However, the administration is criminally prosecuting all immigrants crossing the U.S.-Mexico border.

These families are following domestic and international laws, making their prosecution illegal and against our American values. We should not terrorize these families.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, unless you are an American Indian, we are all immigrants to this country. Whether we ourselves or our forefathers came to this country, we came to seek freedom, a better life, and a better future for our families. Asylum seekers, likewise, are not new. What is new is the zero-tolerance policy.

Zero tolerance is clearly a violation of U.S. laws. It violates international law. It is inhumane. It is shameful.

I ask that the administration come up with real solutions for these folks

seeking asylum. I ask the administration to follow the law, follow American law, follow international law. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the American thing. Let's reunite these families.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman CORREA is a valued member of this body and one of the outstanding members of the Homeland Security Committee, where he is Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency.

We are here today to call upon the President, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Congress of the United States to act without delay to ensure separated immigrant children are reunited with their parents in an expeditious manner.

On June 26, 2018, a federal judge ruled that unless reunification is not in the best interest of the child, a child under 5 years old must be reunited within 14 days of its order.

Yesterday was the deadline that this administration failed to meet.

To President Trump, I say "Time's Up!"

This act committed was not only mortifying, but an illegal act.

This individual has proven he lacks depth and experience, has violated the ethics that this country prides itself on, and he should be ashamed.

This is a senseless act that must not go unnoticed.

We must hold him accountable for these not clearly formulated decisions.

Yesterday, I met with faith and community leaders to bring attention to yesterdays' deadline, imposed by a federal judge, to reunite the youngest separated children with their parents due to the President's egregious "zero-tolerance" policy.

In our country, the rule of law and its implementation is an essential component of our democracy.

Twenty years ago, *Flores v. Reno*, also known as the Flores Agreement, established that migrants or immigrants could not be separated from their children for long periods of time.

Earlier this year, President Trump and his administration implemented a "zero-tolerance policy" of separating immigrant children from their parents upon arrival into the United States.

To be certain, the administration's plan was half-baked.

As the Founder and Chair of the Children's Caucus and as a parent and grandparent, I am outraged that the administration represented what they did not know and could not do.

They did not know the true number of the children separated, they could not reunite these children, and there is no plan for their reunification.

When Americans and the international community from all walks of life began to challenge this cruel and inhumane policy, the courts got involved.

It appears as if a fortnight was more than enough time for this administration to make a complete mess of this process, and in the process damage families—perhaps irreparably.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union, fewer than half of the migrant children who are under five years-old will be reunited with their parents.

Studies have documented that when young children are forcibly removed from their parents, the traumatic experience engenders long-term negative effects on their physical and mental health and well-being suffers.

Stressful situations that would usually prompt physiological responses in other people—increased heart rate, sweaty palms—would provoke nothing in the children forcibly removed from their parents because their fight-or-flight response system appeared permanently broken.

This is outrageous and unacceptable in a nation which has a long and noble tradition of providing sanctuary to the persecuted and oppressed.

Last Friday afternoon, July 6, 2018, the administration asked for more time to reunite these young children with their parents, which again was nothing more than a tacit admission that its plan for separating children was implemented without a way to eventually reunite them with their parents.

After it was ordered to reunite these children, and in asking for more time to comply with the federal court, the President's lawyers asked "can I keep these children away from their parents for a longer time?"

My response is "these children have been away from their parents long enough."

When I visited the border and the federal detention facilities that housed parents and children quarantined from one another, what I witnessed was horrific and was echoed in heartbreaking audio recordings released by the press revealing children crying, aching for their parents, as all face a fate uncertain, and inconsistent with the American ideal.

I will never forget the little children I met during my visit to the border.

One baby, 9-month-old Roger, had been taken from his 19-year-old sister after she was prosecuted for crossing the border illegally.

Their mother is dead, and they were coming here to find family.

Little Leah, was just one year-old and was taken from a grandmother and a sister.

The pain was no less visceral when speaking with mothers wondering where their children have gone.

In South Texas I met Gabby, from Honduras, who had a 45 day-old baby taken from her, and while housed at the facility had not yet been treated or given medical attention.

Yesterday, a federal judge ruled that the administration's argument in favor of child separation was "tortured."

Put another way, the Administration has no leg to stand on.

Trump knows that he is advancing a cruel and inhumane policy, but he refuses to accept responsibility for this matter blaming, alternatively: Congress, the courts and prior presidents.

This is no surprise, of course: all who have watched this president know his proclivity to shirk responsibility for any of his actions.

In a bizarre turn of events, the President actually tried to blame the courts for his own cruel child separation policy.

A federal judge appropriately chastised the President and cast as "cynical" any attempt to blame the courts for his mess, which is entirely of this Administration's own doing.

Tellingly, the judge went one profound step further and indicated that the President and his administration knew—at least for over a year—that there was no facility which would house parents and children together.

Thus, when it proceeded with this new immigration policy, the President knew that the segregation of children from their parents was inevitable and chose to implement this policy anyway.

The last time this nation had policies that promoted the forcible separation of children from newly arrived persons was slavery: a dark and shameful chapter in this nation's history that we cannot revisit.

Earlier this year, President, in proclaiming April as National Child Abuse Prevention Month, stated, "we must always remember that all children are blessings from our Creator" and endowed with value, purpose and human dignity."

It is time for this President and the administration he leads, to act with reason, foresight and compassion and immediately and completely rectify this crisis.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while the Trump administration has clearly taken steps to reunite immigrant children with their families, there are still 100 children under the age of five in the government's custody. The court ordered deadline to reunite all of these children with their parents was yesterday. The Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services must continue to make it a top priority to locate these children's parents and reunite these families in a timely manner.

The Trump administration's inhumane "zero-tolerance" policy was finally stopped by the President, but the terrible effects of this policy continue. DHS' poor recordkeeping has resulted in the prolonged separation of these children. Twelve of these children's parents have already been deported, making it much more difficult for them to reunite with their children. The Department of Homeland Security has had to resort to DNA testing to ensure that children are properly reunited, a costly and tedious process that prolongs the trauma these children are experiencing. This excess cost to American taxpayers could easily have been avoided had the Trump administration thought about the reunification process rather than solely focusing on separating children from their parents.

These children have already endured an incredibly dangerous journey from their home countries, and the Trump administration has subjected them to even more suffering. The American Medical Association has stated that separation from parents can cause lifelong psychological trauma for these children, particularly children who are under the age of five. Sadly, there are already reports of children who no longer recognize their parents after these prolonged periods of separation.

The Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services must take immediate action to expedite the process of reunification, and Congress must use its legislative authority to hold these departments accountable and ensure that these human rights violations are corrected. Children have been taken from their parents, and it is all of our responsibility to ensure that this administration are reuniting them as quickly as possible.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from

New York (Ms. TENNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand here with my colleagues to honor our friend and our great colleague, Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who will be retiring at the end of the 115th Congress after more than 35 years in public service.

I know I speak for everyone on both sides of the aisle when I say that we will sincerely miss ILEANA's bright smile, strong leadership, and fierce advocacy for her constituents.

Today, we look back on her service with gratitude. We recognize her commitment to human rights, providing equal opportunity to all, supporting public education and especially our Nation's veterans. We recall our memories of her great sense of humor and wish her a fond farewell as she begins her next journey in life.

Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN broke through barriers, becoming the first Hispanic woman to serve in the Florida statehouse and senate, later rising to become the first woman to chair the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her record of service is beyond reproach.

At the age of 8, ILEANA's family fled the oppressive communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba. This life-changing experience has guided her journey in public service and led her to remain committed to protecting human rights.

Although I haven't had the opportunity to serve as long as other Members alongside ILEANA, the time I have spent serving with her has been inspirational and an incredible honor.

One of my great memories with ILEANA was a congressional delegation where we traveled to South Korea, Taiwan, and India to study the issues impacting the region and our Nation's relationship with our important allies in Asia. Together, we met with U.S. servicemen and -women near the demilitarized zone in South Korea. Then, later on, we were received by His Holiness the Dalai Lama in the Tibetan community in exile in Dharamshala, India.

During our trip, ILEANA shared with me her experience in Cuba and her family's struggle and journey to the United States. Although the struggle facing the Tibetan people is different than the suffering the Cubans faced under the Castro regime, ILEANA has applied her experience and firsthand knowledge on human rights issues, including Tibetan autonomy and Taiwanese independence, which were highlighted on our trip.

While on the visit, ILEANA was presented with a sash for the Order of the Propitious Clouds, with a special grand cordon for her significant contributions to strengthening U.S.-Taiwan relations.

I thought it would be fun to share a cute story about ILEANA. As we were getting ready to give her this great award as the Propitious Cloud, the Taiwanese Government officials were placing her sash that she received on her. As they were adjusting it and putting it on her, she was so funny. She said: "I haven't been through this since I was Miss America," which I thought was really cute.

She worked as a teacher and a principal in the Miami-Dade County schools. She saw firsthand stories of financial hardship, which eventually inspired her to run for office.

Throughout her time in Congress, she passed legislation that helped thousands of teenagers go to college, and she fought for LGBTQ rights. ILEANA has a servant's heart and was a champion of issues that were of importance to her and the people of Florida.

Although Representative ROS-LEHTINEN may be retiring from her post in this Chamber, we know that she will continue to look for ways to serve the State and country she so dearly loves.

Today, we join with her team and her family in recognizing her many years of service. We all wish Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, her husband, four children, and five beautiful grandchildren all the best in the next chapter.

For me personally, it was a deep honor to work with someone so committed to the greater good. The State of Florida, the United States, and countries throughout the world facing oppression are a better place because of ILEANA's fierce advocacy and commitment to our most vulnerable.

I am joined today by some of my colleagues, although we changed our time. We will be getting to people as soon as we can. A number of colleagues wanted to be here, and, hopefully, they will catch up with us, those people who worked with ILEANA over the years and even had more time with her.

I see in the Chamber we now have Congressman CHARLIE CRIST, who will be getting up and saying a few nice things about Ms. ILEANA and may be reflecting on his probably extensive experience serving side by side with her as a Representative in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CHARLIE CRIST, my colleague.

We are going to stand side by side for this one. ILEANA would love it.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, this is very bipartisan. First, I thank Ms. TENNEY for putting this together. It is wonderful of the gentlewoman to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a few words about ILEANA, what everybody knows. I am sure Mr. GAETZ will echo this, too. Just a wonderful lady, a great public servant, a heart of gold,

and always with a smile on her face. Around this place, that is very uplifting and wonderful to see.

I wanted to come down here and testify, if you will, on her behalf.

□ 1845

What a wonderful shining light she really is. So, again, I thank CLAUDIA for organizing this and putting this together. It is great of her to do so.

And, ILEANA, if you are watching, God bless you and your wonderful family, and I know your future is going to be very, very bright. Thank you so much.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his comments. I appreciate it.

I am a new Member, and the Congressman from Florida (Mr. CRIST) is also a new Member, but we have been touched by ILEANA. And part of the way I got to know her was through 1-minute speeches, which you all see us do on the floor of the House. We sit down in the front row. She is kind of the queen of 1 minutes. She gets to have position A on our side, and no one dares to sit in ILEANA's seat, although she is the most loving, kind person you could ever meet. That is how I got to know her.

She got me so excited and inspired about coming to Asia and joining with her and kind of taking on her love and her portfolio on human rights, particularly helping the people in Taiwan, and especially fighting for the Tibetan Government in exile in Dharamshala, India, with the Dalai Lama.

It was such an honor for me to actually go to Dharamshala with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and to be able to meet the Dalai Lama and sit there with him for an hour as he entertained us. He was really charming and just an incredible inspiration not only to the Tibetan people, but also to the world.

And we are now joined by our terrific colleague, the boy Congressman, our great freshman Representative from Florida's First District, MATT GAETZ. We are honored to have him.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding, and I also thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for her lifetime of service.

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN was my State Representative the day I was born. This is a fact she does not frequently like being reminded of, but it shows the duration and the level of her commitment to the community in south Florida, to the country, and to the world.

What I always remember ILEANA's service for is the commitment that she had to vulnerable people. Whether it was children who were in need of good schools or seniors in need of hospice care, ILEANA could always be counted on to fight for the vulnerable, for those who might not have the fancy lobbyists

or the powerful special interests in their corner. But when ILEANA was in someone's corner, they had a pretty good chance to be successful, whether it has been in the Halls of Congress or in our State capital in Tallahassee.

I am perhaps most moved by the role model that ILEANA has set for women all over the world. Recently, I had the opportunity to travel with ILEANA to Jordan, where there are the initial sprout-ups of democracy. ILEANA met with young women who had an interest in the political process, running for office, campaigning, organizing in their neighborhoods and in their communities for a better life.

They were able to bear witness to this amazing American lady who had done so much, who had broken through so many barriers. It showed, through her life, the great potential that women have all over this world to be able to make such a meaningful contribution to their governments and to their communities.

For all Floridians, and particularly those in south Florida who have benefited from ILY's great service, I just want to thank her, thank her family.

I want to wish my friend, Dexter Douglas, ILEANA's spouse, the best of luck in all the extra time he will have with ILY. I know they are looking forward to spending time with their children and grandchildren, and I look forward to ILEANA's next chapter because I know that, even in her retirement from the Congress, she will never stop fighting for vulnerable people in my State, in our country, and all around the world.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GAETZ for his absolutely perfect description of ILEANA as a champion of human rights and the most vulnerable.

I would just like to mention her husband, Dexter. I haven't had the honor to meet him, but we talked about him quite a bit. Obviously, traveling to Asia, we had a lot of long flights, and it is really such an honor for me as a freshman Member—and you heard from me and Congressman GAETZ, Congressman CRIST, two freshmen Members, and now three who are just so inspired by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Now I am so honored to also invite one of our great women leaders in the U.S. Congress, Mrs. BARBARA COMSTOCK, Congresswoman BARBARA COMSTOCK, to say a few words about ILEANA. She has had a little more time to serve, but we are so honored to have our great Representative from Virginia.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about our wonderful colleague, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and who I was first privileged to meet when I was a staffer here in Congress in the 1990s.

She has gracefully served the people of Florida's 27th District since 1989, and she embodies the type of success story that people think of when they

think of people, wherever they come from all over the world, who come here to the United States.

At just 8 years old, she escaped the brutal regime of Fidel Castro with her family to come to America in pursuit of a better life, to a place where she and her family could find success, and certainly they have found that. But she has never forgotten where she came from and always fought for the oppressed all around the world and those less fortunate.

So she was not only the first Hispanic woman in Congress who fought for all of the things that we have been illuminating here, but she was the first—she had many firsts here, but the first chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, where she was able to take that experience that she had at 8 years old and now, really, bring it all around the world and to be able to bring that kind of heart that we know ILEANA has.

Every bit of her heart is matched by a wonderful sense of humor. And you know when you see ILEANA on the floor, or wherever you see her anywhere, she is cheerleading for everybody. She is fighting for everybody, and she is always happy. She is here with her grandchildren, and she is just a joyful person. We will miss that great smile of hers.

She has been a mentor here to so many women. When she was first here in Congress, there were not many Republican women; and certainly as the first Hispanic woman, she was the first Republican Hispanic woman, also. So she was a great mentor for those of us who were staffers at the time, which is how I was first privileged to meet her. And she has taken this calling to heart as a public servant and has always done the best for her constituents.

She is a woman of great honor, a devoted wife, mother, and grandmother. She has changed this Congress and our colleagues for the better. She is someone for whom we join together in the ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN fan club. And there are, I think, pretty close to 435 Members you could have for that fan club.

We will miss her insight, her intellect, her graciousness, and, as I said, her sense of humor and her passion for representing her constituents, representing the oppressed, and representing human rights all around the world.

ILEANA, it has been a pleasure to serve with you—first as a staffer, now, for these past 3½ years as a Member of Congress where you were such a great mentor, and all of us know you will continue to serve your community even when you leave here in Congress. We know that is in your heart, and we know you will always be a woman who gives to others, and we are so proud to have been able to serve here with you in Congress. God bless.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, we really appreciate Ms. COMSTOCK's kind words.

And now BARBARA is my mentor, as well as one of the early women Repub-

licans who has been an inspiration and a hard worker and really instrumental in coming up with great legislation and really leading our communities.

One of the great honors, I got to be with ILEANA, actually, in, as I said, the Tibetan Government in exile.

I know we have a couple of Members we are waiting to come in. We had to change our time, but we have another Member. Before we get to him, I just want to say a couple of things.

I got to travel to the amazing Tibetan Government in exile, and, obviously, to meet the Dalai Lama in Dharamshala, India, and was greeted by amazing students. It was just a life-changing experience, and to be able to go there with Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, our wonderful Congresswoman.

We were able to get these scarves. I am going to wear this in honor of ILEANA. It is called the khata, and it is a Tibetan Buddhist scarf. When you are handed this scarf, the words are "tashi deley," which the children in Tibet and everyone greets you with when you go there. It is such an amazing experience. I want to wear this scarf in honor of ILEANA.

And, also, I might add, it is very long, and ILEANA is not as tall as I am, so we had to fold her scarf up a couple of times so she wouldn't drag it on the floor.

But it was such a beautiful memory to be able to receive this scarf and to know how important her advocacy has been on behalf of the Tibetan people, who have been suffering under an oppressive regime in Beijing that has really bullied this amazing community and left them in exile in India, and her fight to bring the Tibetan people back to their home country some day.

We are going to continue on that front, and I hope to carry on the tradition and carry on the fight, as ILEANA has, with compassion and with courage and the inspiration that we received from so many.

Now it is my great honor to yield to my colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) to say a few words about our great leader, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. TENNEY, my good friend from New York, as well, for leading this night and for this tribute. It is well deserved for the great friend ILEANA is and a great friend to us here, as well as an amazing Member for her district, for representing her people with energy and with all that it takes to be effective for the many years that she did so. And so you saw that level of energy here in this place and in our Conference.

I was always pleased to be able to work with her on issues, but just seeing her for a minute each time because she would—CLAUDIA talked a little bit about the height disparity, so for her and me, it is quite something else. But she would always come up to me. And me coming from a ranching background and farming background in

northern California, I have always got these cowboy boots on. So I just got the handle from her: Hey, Cowboy, how are you doing?

And I didn't really know what to call her, so I just went with "Cowgirl." So she is my Miami cowgirl friend. So that was just part of the fun of having such a great colleague like that, and I was really, indeed, disappointed to see and to hear and to know that she was deciding to hang it up here. But everybody—everybody—has that time.

She led here with, again, grace and dignity, but also with enough fire to get the job done. I know she was an amazing Representative for the people of her district and for all of us to hear the diverse sides of all the issues that affect her part of Florida and how that might contrast with my part of California. And you take that into mind because she is effective at getting a point across respectfully but, again, with the pizzazz it takes to be an effective leader here. So we will dearly miss her.

To my friend, from Cowboy: Cowgirl, enjoy your next endeavor here, and it has been a pleasure to work with you. God bless you.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful tribute to a wonderful woman who has inspired us all. So much of what Mr. LAMALFA said about her sense of humor.

I always think of the great leaders that you meet. You think of some towering figure, but LEANA was a towering figure in her very small body, and I think of a few things about her:

Her courage and her tenacity and her willingness to be truthful and to fight the fight. And also a couple of things that I learned from my father that I find that, when I find people with these rare qualities, like LEANA, her unwillingness to succumb to victimhood.

She is a fighter. She has never felt sorry for herself. She is always fighting the good fight for other people who are less fortunate than she is. She probably doesn't even recognize that is one of her great, inspiring qualities that I saw in her.

And, also, her willingness to not hold a grudge and to be bipartisan and to reach across the aisle and to work with other Members without sacrificing her values and her integrity.

This may be the first Special Order that we are going to hear on the great Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, but I am not sure it is going to be the last. We still have, luckily, hopefully, a few more months, or several more months of her right to the end of the year, and we will be able to continue to honor this really amazing person who has graced this institution with leadership, with tenacity, with courage, with passion and compassion for those who are less fortunate.

I know that she is going to continue in her private life, outside of politics, on the same mission that she is on because that is who she is. She is going to fight the fight every day. She is going

to stand up for the most needy and the most vulnerable in our communities.

And just on a personal note, I am so grateful for this position and the privilege of serving New York's 22nd District, that I had the honor of being able to be in the presence of greatness, to be with Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and her amazing inspiration. And I just want to say thank you so much to her and to her family and to Dexter, whom I hope I get to meet some day; and to her children and grandchildren, who are so lucky to be among someone and to be able to grow up with someone like LEANA; and her constituents, who I am sure are grateful every day for the work that she has done in this institution and to change it forever for the better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you so much for this tribute to Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, the first Hispanic woman to serve in Florida state's House or Senate—went on to become the first Latina in Congress and rose to be the first woman to chair the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

She's inspired many of us to follow her public service example.

For over three decades she's been a champion for the LGBTQ community, a critical voice in promoting democracy in Cuba and Venezuela, a leader in advancing the well-being of the Hispanic Community, and a tireless human rights advocate across the globe.

I've been proud to work with Rep. ROS-LEHTINEN on initiatives like:

BRIDGE

United States-Israel Agriculture Strategic Partnership Act

Hurricane Irma Disaster Relief in Florida

Hurricane Maria Disaster Relief in Puerto Rico

She has a gift of bringing people together. Floridians are proud to have had LEANA as a public servant and her legacy will live on.

□ 1900

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting story in Politico this week titled: "The Secret Story of How America Lost the Drug War With the Taliban." It was written by Josh Meyer. It says: "As Afghanistan edged ever closer to becoming a narco-state five years ago, a team of veteran U.S. officials in Kabul presented the Obama administration with a detailed plan to use U.S. courts to prosecute the Taliban commanders and allied drug lords who supplied more than 90 percent of the world's heroin . . ."

Mr. Speaker, that is incredible. I have been hearing from DEA agents, local police, deputies, so many law enforcement people, about how incredibly abundant heroin is in America. How we had so many people that would get hooked on opioids, and then they would

ultimately find heroin was cheaper and more plentiful. It destroyed a lot of lives, and it continues to destroy lives in America.

To have this report come out that the Obama administration could have done something in a timely manner to have saved tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of lives from being lost or being wasted in this opioid epidemic of addiction, it is really staggering to think that our United States Government, the Obama administration, with all of its tools, had the chance to do something that would prevent the massive personal destructions that we have witnessed, it runs over into the unconscionable area.

This article says: "The plan, according to its authors, was both a way of halting the ruinous spread of narcotics around the world and a new—and urgent—approach to confronting ongoing frustrations with the Taliban, whose drug profits were financing the growing insurgency and killing American troops. But the Obama administration's deputy chief of mission in Kabul, citing political concerns, ordered the plan to be shelved, according to a Politico investigation."

Now, I have not always been the biggest Politico fan, but this is extraordinary.

"Now, its authors—Drug Enforcement Administration agents and Justice Department legal advisers at the time—are expressing anger over the decision, and hope that the Trump administration, which has followed a path similar to former President Barack Obama's in Afghanistan, will eventually adopt the plan as part of its evolving strategy."

"This was the most effective and sustainable tool we had for disrupting and dismantling Afghan drug trafficking organizations and separating them from the Taliban," said Michael Marsac, the main architect of the plan as the DEA's regional director for Southwest Asia at the time. "But it lies dormant, buried in an obscure file room, all but forgotten."

"A senior Afghan security official, M. Ashraf Haidari, also expressed anger at the Obama administration when told about how the U.S. effort to indict Taliban narcotics kingpins was stopped dead in its tracks 16 months after it began."

"It brought us almost to the breaking point, put our elections into a time of crisis, and then our economy almost collapsed," Haidari said of the drug money funding the Taliban. "If that operation had continued, we wouldn't have had this massive increase in production and cultivation as we do now."

This is a photograph showing scoring a poppy to extract raw opium in April of 2004.

"Afghan drug lords have pledged financial support to the Taliban in exchange for protection of their vast swaths of poppy and cannabis fields, drug processing labs, and storage facilities."

“Poppy cultivation, heroin production, terrorist attacks and territory controlled by the Taliban are now at or near record highs. President Ashraf Ghani”—who I have met. He seems like a very decent gentleman—“said recently that Afghanistan’s military—and the government itself—would be in danger of imminent collapse, perhaps within days, if U.S. assistance stops.”

When we heard the Obama administration condemning the opioid addiction epidemic, we didn’t know that that administration had a chance to end 90 percent of the heroin coming into this country. Apparently, so much of that flows across our southern border.

And I realize that the leaders in the U.S. Senate and the leaders in the United States House did not support the pillars of Donald Trump’s platform that got him elected President of the United States. Every bill that we have brought out of the House or that has come out of the Senate, even a couple of times there has been a little bit of money for a border wall, it is not as serious as it should be that this Congress should be doing something about the travesty on our southern border.

As long as it remains so open, the drug cartels will continue to make tens, hundreds of billions of dollars. I read that just the drug money across our southern border last year was around \$80 billion, and I have also understood that the projections are that the drug cartels may be making more from human trafficking across our southern border than they are even from their drug money. That money is being used to keep our Mexico friend and neighbor oppressed and in bondage.

The best thing that we could do, if we really and truly cared about the people of Mexico, about the people of Guadalajara, El Salvador, of so many countries in Central America, and even South America, that are caught up in human trafficking, drug trafficking, and sex trafficking that is going on and coming across the U.S. border is stop it. We stop the flow of the billions that are being spent, or made, by the drug cartels, then they don’t have the money for the corruption that resides in so much of Mexico and south of Mexico.

That is what a good neighbor should do. That is what this House should do. That is what the Senate should do. Tell our rich lobbyist friends that we are going to save American lives, and we are going to make Mexico one of the 10 top economies in the world by gutting their corruption, because we are going to enforce a secure border to our south, and they need to get ready and used to it. But we are going to have to have leadership in both the House and the Senate that will step up to the task.

Enough lives have been lost, enough girls have been subjected to sex trafficking, enough lives have been wasted in drug addiction, enough lives have been lost in trying to get here, evilly lured here by the attraction of what might come. Fathers that would even

provide birth control to daughters, knowing they are likely to be raped on the way to the United States. What kind of people are we that we would lure people into that kind of situation? Well, we are doing it.

And I hear it over and over from those people that guard our border and from the people that are not insane, they are not crazy, they are not stupid, they are just ignorant about the role of ICE in America. ICE does not protect our borders. That is the Border Patrol. We also have that supplemented by others that are assisting the Border Patrol.

ICE is really the one that sometimes has been referred to by—that part of Homeland Security, has been labeled by drug cartels, according to people on the border, as the drug cartel’s logistics. Because they get people illegally across our border, and then Homeland Security, with the help of ICE—there are children involved that involves Health and Human Services, HHS—they ship them around the country to whatever address the drug cartels give the individuals and tell them that this is where you are going, and you can finish paying off your fee to us by working for us at the address where we send you, either in sex trafficking, drug trafficking, or whatever.

□ 1915

Yes, so we are taking United States Government money; we are prying it out of the hardworking hands of Americans; and we are using it to help the drug cartels build up their employee base all over America.

It is time that people in the Republican Party woke up and realized the amount of human suffering that our failure to secure our southern border is causing. President Trump is doing what he can, but he could do a whole lot more if we gave him the tools to do it.

How heartless can we be not to secure our southern border and allow the deaths, the rapes, the drug abuse that is overwhelming our country. We have got to stop it.

The Obama administration had a chance to cut it off at its root source. They killed the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good idea—I know our friend Mike Pompeo is busy right at this moment, but there are others in the State Department, there are people in Homeland Security, Secretary Nielsen, others. We can do something about it. We have got to do something about it. It is what decent, caring people would do.

And those, including any judge who says you have got to give these children back to people who may not be their parents, people who have convictions for human trafficking and sex trafficking or child molestation, ought to come up on charges themselves.

Fortunately, one judge backed off of the deadline that had been set for getting certain children back to their parents, because Homeland Security and

HHS is doing everything they can as quickly as they can to make sure if they give children to adults, they are not sex traffickers and they are not drug traffickers, there is a family relationship. And it appears a great deal of work has been done along those lines. So there are at least five or six children who have not been turned over to people who were not their family or people who had drug or child molestation offenses.

But this is serious stuff. It is what we do. It is why our Nation, so many of us, became outraged when we found out that young, beautiful little girls competing as Olympians for the United States in the world were sexually molested by an adult monster.

And then we have the wannabes, adult men who set records and won wrestling matches. They could take down the strongest and best in the country, take them down if they didn’t like what they were doing. They could take them down if they got in a ring and the match started. They could take them down. And two guys like that come forward, say: Yeah. Okay. So I was an adult. So I could have been out in Afghanistan shooting and killing people. I was no match for some wimpy doctor who made come-on comments.

Somebody like that would be allowed to besmirch the name of JIM JORDAN. It is disgusting. And any group that would glom on to something like that, it is disgusting.

Assassinating an honorable character used to be a virtually unpardonable sin in America. But what happens when you quit teaching about right and wrong, you quit teaching about the Ten Commandments, you quit teaching that we are all accountable for our own actions, and you start teaching, instead, that everything is relative? There is no right. There is no wrong. There is only convenient and politically expedient. When political expedience becomes more important in America, like it has for some, and right and wrong goes out the window, we have no business maintaining the same form of governance.

It is time to get back to teaching right and wrong, because there are such.

C. S. Lewis said he used to enjoy making fun of Christians when he was an atheist by saying: How can you say there is a just God in the world when there is so much injustice in the world?

And no matter what they would come back with as a response, these Christians, Lewis would say: Yes, yes, that is all well and good, but wouldn’t it be easier just to admit there can’t be a just God in the universe when there is so much injustice?

And then one day he finally realized: If there is not some absolute source of right and wrong in the world, justice and injustice, then how could he ever know there is so much injustice in the world? It would be like a man blind from birth being unable to know what light is.

But there is an absolute source of justice in the world, and that is why, in 1787, in Philadelphia, when our Nation's leaders struggled to come up with a new constitution, that Ben Franklin, who so many teachers across the country wrongly say was a deist, as some do about Washington, said:

I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: God governs in the affairs of men, and if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid?

We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writing, that unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.

Franklin said:

I firmly believe this: I also believe without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel. We will be confounded by our local partial interests and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

He went on to move that they start having prayer to start each of their days at Independence Hall working on the Constitution, just like they did throughout the Revolution. But if you go back and look at the debate, you find the reason that was voted down. They didn't have anybody who everybody else would agree would do a fair prayer for all the different Christian denominations.

So during the Revolution, they hired a chaplain who always did what all the Christian denominations believed was a fair prayer, but as they explained in debate: We are not getting paid. We don't have a treasury. We can't hire a chaplain. We can't do that right now.

And so next they moved to Randolph of Virginia, his motion: Okay. Here we are at the end of June. I move that we recess—this is not his exact words, but in essence:

Let's recess, reconvene on our Nation's birthday, Independence Day, at one of the local churches. Let's worship God together. And after we as a group here have worshiped God together, then let's come back and try this again. We are not making progress.

That passed. They went to the Reformed Calvinistic Church in Philadelphia. And it must have gone well. You can find prayers that the presiding pastor, the Reverend William Rogers, prayed. He brought that group together through prayer by the grace of God, and they came back and gave us the greatest founding document in the history of the world.

We have got to get back to where we teach right and wrong. That is why John Adams in 1797, as President of the United States, said:

This Constitution was meant for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other.

And he was right. And when you fail to instill those moral understandings that brought C. S. Lewis around from being an atheist to being one of the most effective and greatest apologists for Christianity in its history, we have got to get back to that or the Constitution cannot work, and you will have administrations that commit heinous,

reproachable acts as leaders of the Nation.

We ask that God bless America, but there are certain things a nation of people are supposed to do to be blessed people and merit the blessings of Heaven, as our Founders often referred to them.

Let's stand up for what is right. Let's stop the political vindictiveness, and the Nation will be better and be more likely to be blessed.

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

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution recognizing 100 years of the United States-Australia relationship—100 years of Matship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 10, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 770. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2061. To reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5504. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Economic and Risk Analysis, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting Commission's final rule — Inline XBRL Filing of Tagged Data (RIN: 3235-AL59) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5505. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Securities Transaction Settlement Cycle [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0013] (RIN: 1557-AE24) received June 25, 2018, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5506. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Hampshire; Delegation of Authority [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0069; FRL-9979-29-Region 1] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5507. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC; VOC Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0557; FRL-9979-92-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5508. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to the Permitting Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0148; FRL-9979-69-Region 8] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5509. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0034; FRL-9980-09-Region 5] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5510. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Revisions to PSD Permitting Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2018-0136; FRL-9979-76-Region 8] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5511. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetochlor; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0235; FRL-9976-41] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5512. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; AK; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0590; FRL-9979-87-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5513. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Update to Include New Jersey State Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2017-0723; FRL-9977-64-Region 2] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5514. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxirane, 2-methyl-, polymer with oxirane, mono[2-(2-methoxymethlethoxy)methylethoxy] methylether] ether; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0071; FRL-9978-08] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5515. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alaska; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R10-OAR-2017-0745; FRL-9980-00-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5516. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0143; FRL-9979-97-Region 7] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5517. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiencazabone-methyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0448; FRL-9978-50] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5518. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tolfenpyrad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0156; FRL-9976-21] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5519. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mercury; Reporting Requirements for the TSCA Mercury Inventory [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2017-0421; FRL-9979-74] (RIN: 2070-AK22) received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5520. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC: Multiple Revisions to Air Pollution Control Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0385; FRL-9979-80-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5521. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC: Definitions and Open Burning [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0387; FRL-9979-78-Region 4] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5522. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluroxypyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0225; FRL-9978-70] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5523. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benzovindiflupyr; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0167; FRL-9977-94] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5524. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nebraska Air Quality Implementation Plans; Adoption of a New Chapter under the Nebraska Administrative Code [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0386; FRL-9979-85-Region 7] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5525. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of the Sudanese Sanctions Regulations and Amendment of the Terrorism List Government Sanctions Regulations received June 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5526. A letter from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Global Magnitsky Sanctions Regulations received June 28, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5527. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-392, "Public Housing Credit-Building Pilot Program Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5528. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-380, "Commission on the Arts and Humanities Temporary Amendment Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5529. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting DC Act 22-395, "Green Finance Authority Establishment Act of 2018", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5530. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Ocean Dumping; Withdrawal of Designated Disposal Site; Grays Harbor, Washington [EPA-R10-OW-2018-0284; FRL-9979-31-Region 10] received June 21, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5531. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Process for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Physicians To Be Added to the National Registry of Certified Medical Examiners [Docket No.: FMCSA-2016-0333] (RIN: 2126-AB97) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5532. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's interim final rule — Previously-incurred costs in the WIFIA program [EPA-HQ-OW-2016-0569; FRL-9979-90-OW] received June 21,

2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5533. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's 2017 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1117; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5534. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's correcting amendments — Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Amendments; Response to Appeals [Docket No. PHMSA-2013-0225 (HM-218H)] (RIN: 2137-AF27) received June 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5535. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major rule — Rules of Conduct and Standards of Responsibility for Appointed Representatives [Docket No.: SSA-2013-0044] (RIN: 0960-AH63) received July 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5536. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2017 Report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3213; Public Law 89-136, Sec. 603 (as added by Public Law 105-393, Sec. 102(a)); (112 Stat. 3614); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Financial Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5105. A bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 989. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-815). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 6330. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the method for prescribing size standards for business concerns; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 6331. A bill to allow States to elect to observe daylight savings time for the duration of the year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 6332. A bill to require the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to submit a report to Congress on the way in which data collected pursuant to title 31 is being used, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BARTON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 6333. A bill to require the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to submit a report on the Taxpayer Identification Number Perfection Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 6334. A bill to support coding education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 6335. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 322 Main Street in Oakville, Connecticut, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 6336. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to grant farm numbers to individuals with certain documentation, to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to include qualified intermediaries as recipients of farm ownership loans, to provide for a study of farmland tenure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGE, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 6337. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to require Congressional approval before the President adjusts imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6338. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds by the National Endowment for the Arts to award a grant for South Dakota State University's "Historic Hobo Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6339. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds by the Department of Health and Human Services to award a grant for any virtual reality platform designed to teach children in China how to cross the street; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 6340. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to cap prescription drug cost-sharing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6341. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the extension or renewal of certain reasonable cost reimbursement contracts under the Medicare program through 2020; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 987. A resolution condemning the Attorney General's decision in "Matter of A-B" seeking to declare domestic violence and gang violence as invalid grounds for seeking asylum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Res. 988. A resolution recognizing the importance of diversity in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, acknowledging a necessity to increase diversity and representation within physics, and expressing support for the American Physical Society Bridge Program for its work toward increasing the number of underrepresented minorities earning physics doctoral degrees; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTSINGER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. DUNN,

Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BIGGS, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H. Res. 990. A resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Homeland Security, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 6330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 6331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states

that Congress has the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 6333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 6334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 1

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 6335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7, "The Congress shall have Power to . . . establish Post Offices and Post Roads . . ."

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 6336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, subsection 1: "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises"

and

Article 1, Section 8, subsection 3: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations"

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ROSEN:

H.R. 6340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 6341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 173: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 184: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 365: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 398: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 574: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 712: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 756: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 785: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 795: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 943: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1080: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1102: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1150: Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. YODER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1160: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1171: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 1175: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 1201: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1227: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1267: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 1300: Mr. CLAY and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1421: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1439: Mr. KIND and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1606: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1615: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CRIST, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAMB, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1651: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1697: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1876: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1881: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1898: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2015: Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2101: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 2276: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2293: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 2306: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2409: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 2514: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2556: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2566: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2583: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2648: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2856: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2871: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2943: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3000: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 3032: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3145: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 3330: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3536: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3602: Ms. MOORE, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3692: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KILMER, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 3842: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3960: Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3976: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 3988: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4022: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 4024: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 4106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4117: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4122: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4184: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 4251: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4253: Mr. HIGGINS of New York and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4260: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4265: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 4312: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 4413: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4444: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 4549: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 4556: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4610: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 4616: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 4649: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 4886: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 4898: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 4944: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4952: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 4962: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 4969: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 5001: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5011: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 5034: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 5061: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5090: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5105: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 5107: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 5108: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 5116: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 5138: Mr. ESTES of Kansas.

H.R. 5153: Mr. CRAMER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 5160: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 5171: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5223: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 5238: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON

LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 5266: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 5281: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 5288: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 5292: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 5300: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 5339: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 5343: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 5354: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 5374: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 5413: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 5508: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 5533: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 5538: Mr. COFFMAN and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 5571: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 5573: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5576: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 5588: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5595: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 5598: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 5618: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 5649: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 5671: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 5697: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 5701: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 5771: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5849: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 5863: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5882: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 5922: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 5924: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 5938: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 5942: Mr. FOSTER and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 5988: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 6010: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 6014: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 6016: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 6018: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 6048: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6086: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 6108: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 6131: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6143: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 6144: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 6159: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 6178: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 6180: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 6216: Mr. BUCK and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 6217: Mr. BUCK and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 6236: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 6260: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 6261: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 6287: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 6312: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6313: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 6314: Mr. ROKITA.

July 11, 2018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H6113

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.J. Res. 135: Mr. EVANS.
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. HOLDING.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H. Res. 202: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 220: Mr. KING of New York.
H. Res. 256: Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 395: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 750: Mr. RASKIN.

H. Res. 785: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 826: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BACON, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 864: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 910: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 919: Mr. FLORES and Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida.
H. Res. 943: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Res. 966: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 967: Mr. COOK and Mr. BYRNE.
H. Res. 975: Mr. KIND.
H. Res. 982: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LOEBBACK, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.