

day, represents what Lincoln called the "last best hope of mankind."

We come in gratitude to know that in every generation, there are such heroes among us who will step forth from the safety of hearth and home and into mortal peril to protect their fellow citizens. Patton put it best when he said: "It is foolish and wrong to mourn the men who died. Rather, we should thank God that such men lived."

We come out of recognition that although the suffering of these fallen heroes has ended, the suffering of their families goes on day in and day out. There are Gold Star families among us who spend their Memorial Days not at barbecues and beach parties but in solemn ceremonies and quiet vigils around honored graves. We honor their loved ones in hopes that in some small way, we can help fortify them against the loss that they bear every day of their lives.

But most of all, we come in recognition of Shakespeare's plea that "this story shall the good man teach his son."

A few years ago, I had the honor to visit members of the 3rd United States Infantry Old Guard who tend the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery. They are meticulously dressed and painstakingly drilled as they honor the memory of our fallen warriors.

It is quite an impressive sight. And on a warm spring day like this, thousands of tourists will show up to watch and to join the Old Guard for a moment to honor the sacrifices memorialized at the tomb.

Tourists don't often show up during hurricanes or in driving snowstorms or at 2 o'clock in the morning in sleet and hail, but the Old Guard does. They commit 2 years of their lives to this service, under the strictest of conditions.

I asked this young sergeant, "Why? Why do you do this?"

His answer was simple and direct: "Because, sir, we want to demonstrate to our fellow Americans that we will never forget."

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I bring this bill to the House today with the unanimous support of the entire California congressional delegation. We do so to ensure that our fellow Americans never forget Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote.

In consultation with his family, we have identified a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest overlooking where Sky Mote and his family often camped and hiked. This bill proposes that it forever more be known as Sky Point as a token of our Nation's respect of his heroism, its appreciation of his sacrifice, its sympathy for his family, and of its solemn pledge that succeeding generations of his countrymen will never forget him.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 979 will designate a mountain peak in the John Muir Wil-

derness of the Sierra National Forest in California as Sky Point in recognition of fallen Marine Corps Staff Sergeant Sky Mote.

Sky served our country honorably as a U.S. marine for 9 years. He had one tour of duty in Iraq and two in Afghanistan. As a member of the 1st Marine Special Operations Battalion, he was deployed to Afghanistan as part of Operation Enduring Freedom. However, on August 10, 2012, Sky's battalion received heavy gunfire from an attacker dressed as an Afghan police officer.

Jumping into action, Sky exposed himself to the gunfire in order to distract the shooter and draw his attention away from his fellow Marines. In his final act of valor, he engaged the attacker in the open, allowing his comrades to find safety.

For his heroic actions, Sky received the Navy Cross, a Purple Heart, the Navy-Marine Corps Commendation Medal, a Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal, two Combat Action Ribbons, and three Good Conduct Medals.

The mountain peak this bill seeks to name in his honor was very special to him. Every year, creating lasting memories, Staff Sergeant Mote and his family would set up camp beneath its point on hunting trips to the area. By designating that mountain peak "Sky Point," we will honor Sky Mote's memory and ensure his selfless sacrifice for his country and fellow Marines is not forgotten.

I just hope that the many hunters, mountaineers, and backpackers who visit Sky Point have an opportunity to learn of the man for whom the peak is named.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, we can name this unnamed peak as a small measure of our Nation's gratitude to this noble soldier, noble warrior, Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, for all he has done for us on our behalf. It is a fitting tribute, and it is the least that we can do for him and his family.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 979.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1335.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274 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. 1335.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1537

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. 1335) 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. COLLINS of New York 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 Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1335 makes a decent Federal law a better Federal law, and I commend the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his leadership and his dedication to strengthening and updating our Federal fisheries laws.

The bill that we have before us today on the floor represents years of hard work on a comprehensive reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. That is why this bill was given such a high priority by our committee and was such a major effort of trying to make this one of the first bills we brought out.

This bill was originally passed in 1976, was updated in 1996 and again in 2006, and illustrates the same principle: that all bills age. And though principles of government may be eternal, specific administrative laws are in need of constant review by a legislative body. That is our job. This bill does that. It is a good bill for our economy. It is a good bill for our jobs.

In 2012, the seafood industry had a sales impact of \$141 billion, \$59 billion in value-added impacts, and supported 1.3 million jobs earning \$39 billion in income.

The U.S. commercial fishermen directly contributed with 9.6 billion pounds of fish and shellfish harvested, earning another \$5.1 billion in revenue from their catches. There are 11 million recreational saltwater anglers, spending \$25 billion on trips and gear in 2012, generating \$58 billion in sales impacts and supporting 300,000 to 400,000 U.S. jobs.

Commercial and recreational fishermen and the seafood industry that manages how the fish get from the boat to our table, they support this legislation. I want to reemphasize that that is perhaps unique. For the first time, all three elements—commercial, seafood industry, recreational fishermen—are all in support of updating this law in this particular fashion.

This bill provides flexibility, and it is a bill for the entire Nation. So it provides the flexibility that is essential for the fishing community in New England. It provides and incorporates State and local data on making fish population assessments, which is significant for the fish community in the Gulf of Mexico. It provides greater transparency as to how management decisions are made in a very open way, which is what it is supposed to be doing in the first place.

The proposed changes were not developed overnight. The Natural Resources Committee held 10 hearings, heard more than 80 witnesses over the last 4 years in deliberating over the changes that are needed to this particular law. That is why I am very pleased with the positive statements that have been made by both sides of the aisle on this legislation.

During the last Congress, the ranking member at that time said “the changes that were negotiated on a number of provisions of the bill” were something for which he thanked the majority.

Another one of the minority members was quoted also as saying: “I do appreciate the fact that you reached out to us on the Democratic side of the aisle and many of the provisions, as you mentioned, that are in the bill did come from input from the Democratic side.”

Those words speak for themselves. This bill is the product of years of work, having reached out to Members on both sides of the aisle, having reached out to Members in different regions of our country, reached out to stakeholders of varying perspectives, and we reached out to the agency to craft a reauthorization that improves the process. We have done that.

It is unfortunate in my mind the administration recently announced opposition to this bill. Rather than giving you my thoughts on that—or maybe that is a reason why you would support it in the first place—let me simply quote the New Bedford Standard-Times. They did an editorial in their paper in that bastion of conservatism, Massachusetts. They disagreed with the White House’s opposition to the bill, and they ended by saying: “Looking at the bill and its accomplishment of making management more responsive to science, and contrasting it with the empty arguments of the White House policy statement, it seems very clear where politics fits into this.”

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a win for consumers. It is a win for the industry that puts food on our tables. It is a win

for the restaurants. It is a win for the recreational fishermen. It is a win for better and more transparent science. It is a win for our environment. It is a win for the American taxpayers. There is no significant increase in the cost, but there is a significant increase in the solutions in this area, which is, once again, why all the major players who were involved in this—both the commercial side, recreational side—are in common agreement that this is the way we need to go forward.

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

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

Last year, the Natural Resources Committee reported a bill almost identical to this one with only one Democratic Member voting in favor. Dubbed the “Empty Oceans Act” by fishermen and conservationists across the country, the bill met stiff opposition both on and off Capitol Hill, and the Republican leadership did not bring it up for consideration by the full House. That showed remarkable restraint and good judgment.

Fast forward 1 year to today’s debate and the vote on legislation that has the same flaws and has drawn the same opposition. The only real difference is this time around, not a single committee Democrat voted to report the bill. Committee Republicans did not reach out to us to discuss changes that might have made this a bipartisan effort, even though the original Magnuson-Stevens Act and the 1996 and 2006 reauthorizations were bipartisan and passed both Houses of Congress with virtually no opposition.

Those efforts made necessary, legitimate, and incremental changes to U.S. fisheries law that have moved us closer and closer to achieving the goal of sustainable, profitable fisheries. We had an opportunity to reauthorize Magnuson and continue moving in the right direction, but once again, House Republicans have let partisanship get in the way of progress.

Instead of working with us to craft thoughtful, targeted legislation to update Magnuson, Republicans have taken this as an opportunity to assault bedrock conservation laws while at the same time taking us back to fisheries management policies that we know have failed fishing communities in the past.

As Chairman BISHOP said himself, when testifying before the Rules Committee last month, these are “not just modest amendments, these are major amendments.” I could not agree more.

□ 1545

Provisions in the bill which will end successful efforts to rebuild overfished stocks and coastal economy are major amendments. Short-circuiting public review under NEPA is a major amendment. Overriding the Endangered Species Act, the Antiquities Act, and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act laws

that have made fisheries more sustainable and productive by protecting vulnerable sea life and valuable ocean habitat are major, major amendments.

These amendments are also unnecessary. NOAA recently announced that the value of U.S. fisheries has reached an all-time high, while the number of overfished stock has reached an all-time low. We should celebrate these gains, but also recognize we have room for improvement.

Not all fisheries have received the benefit of the transition to the sustainable harvest levels because transition is still underway. For example, overfishing of Atlantic cod in New England waters occurred in 2013 and 2014, despite the Magnuson mandate to end overfishing. The science-based conservation measures in the law will end this overfishing, rebuild the stocks, but not if the bill before us were to become law.

We must stay the course: fully rebuild fisheries that can contribute and will contribute \$31 billion to the economy and support half a million new jobs. We cannot afford to go back to the bad old days where politics trumped science in fishery management. Instead, let’s go back to the drawing board and work together on a bill to reauthorize Magnuson-Stevens and keep improving on our fisheries.

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

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 184. An act to amend the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act to require background checks before foster care placements are ordered in tribal court proceedings, and for other purposes.

S. 246. An act to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of this piece of legislation. He is the senior member of our committee, as well as someone who knows more about this issue than probably anyone else on the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Thank you to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, history is a wonderful thing. People who went through the