

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.