

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

Just a couple of points to my friend from Texas. He is correct on the open process. However, we did allow for all 10 amendments that were submitted to be accepted, and the final vote was 2-9, understanding that that was a foregone conclusion to many of us.

I would just say that this is such an important issue in the urgency, and I would like to join with my colleague to fix the standard and the practice, and to add funding so that the Department can do it.

There is an urgency for problems like this to be solved. We can save money in the long run. When I was in local government, I was on the governing board of our county hospital. Two of our five floors were psych wards. We spent hours and hours in closed sessions dealing with liability issues on those wards.

So when I read this bill, I think that so much of what is in this bill, many of us have already done, at least from California at the local level and at the State level, and it is good business practice.

As somebody who is a former small business owner that had high workers' compensation in the restaurant business, cost avoidance is a good thing. My workers' compensation carrier came out at least once a year to inspect our facilities and see where we could avoid these incidents. So it is just a good business practice.

When I look at this, it makes so much sense. There is a cost to start this, but there is, clearly, in my mind, a fiscal savings and an emotional savings when you think of the lives lost. This is not new, but the demand in the changing trend lines say to me that this is urgent.

So I would like to agree with my friend from Texas and I would be happy to work with him, but with incidents like this, this Department really needs to be ramped up. It is a national embarrassment that it takes 20 years, or 7 years for the Department to do these rules, understanding that you have to work with stakeholders.

So I think there is an element of opportunity here for us. I do think that it is unfortunate, as we talked about in the Rules Committee last night, and Mr. BYRNE talked about, that we couldn't get across the finish line and come together completely as a bipartisan bill.

Having said that, as my friend from Texas alluded to, this is a bipartisan bill. We do have supporters, including Mr. COLE.

Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I understand that the gentleman has no additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his comments, and I would agree that the effi-

cient functioning of any Federal agency should always be our highest priority. The efficient use of the taxpayer funding that goes into those agencies or branches of agencies should require our constant attention. We should always be looking to improve the service and the protection that those agencies provide.

I will also predict that this bill is likely to pass with a large margin and it will be bipartisan and will raise the question of why we are not considering it under a suspension of the rules. Nevertheless, that is what the majority has chosen to use their time doing this week, so we have the bill in front of us today.

Workplace violence is a threat that no American should have to face. The threat is particularly high for healthcare providers and for social service workers. These workers dedicate their lives to taking care of others, and they deserve to be taken care of in return.

I support the goal of this legislation. I believe it would benefit from further discussion to ensure that the timeline for issuing a rule and developing a workplace violence prevention plan will produce the most effective and safe outcome for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for his comments.

Democratic and Republican administrations have sat idly by while healthcare and social service workers are being beaten, abused, and killed. The problem is not going away. It is getting worse.

In the words of the ranking member of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, he will be voting for the bill because it is better than what we have got. I certainly agree.

This bill does far better for our frontline workers who we ask to care for us every day. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. BURGESS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 713

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property. 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 the ranking mi-

nority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and

(2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam 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. BURGESS. Madam 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1333

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILD) at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

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 motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

EXTENDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 182) to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 182

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

SECTION 1. CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE ADVISORY COMMISSION.

Effective September 26, 2018, section 8(a) of Public Law 87-126 (16 U.S.C. 459b-7(a)) is amended in the second sentence by striking "2018" and inserting "2028".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 182, introduced by Representative BILL KEATING from Massachusetts, would reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission, which expired under current law in September 2018. This bill would reauthorize and extend it until 2028.

Since the national seashore was originally created in 1961, it was actually the first national seashore. It is the second most beautiful national seashore, but it was the first national seashore created.

The advisory commission has served as a main forum for consultation and coordination between local communities and the National Park Service. Comprised of representatives from the six towns within the park, Barnstable County, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the Secretary of the Interior, this advisory commission gives surrounding communities a voice in the management of the seashore.

I thank Representative KEATING for his leadership in introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 182.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 182, which extends the authorization of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission until 2028.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was established in 1961. It comprises more than 40,000 acres on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. The enabling legislation also provided for an advisory commission comprised of six Cape Cod communities located within the seashore and the county to consult with the Secretary of the Interior about the development of the seashore. This is as it should be.

The Federal Government must be a good neighbor to the communities that its lands impact, and consulting them as partners is a fundamental point of this principle.

One of the unique aspects of this advisory commission is that the Secretary of the Interior cannot issue commercial, industrial, or recreational permits without the advice of the commission, as long as action is taken in a timely manner.

In addition, the commission meets regularly with the park superintendent to discuss specific seashore issues and

to advise him about seashore programs, facilities, and activities, providing valuable local feedback to the national seashore. This feedback helps to promote sound park management, improve public access, and it ensures that the National Park Service is a good neighbor to its surrounding communities.

This is a model of how the Federal Government's land managers should be governed. My only regret is that its provisions don't apply to every community affected by Federal landholdings. I cannot help but note that the Federal Government owns just 1.2 percent of Massachusetts while giving great deference to its local communities. Meanwhile, it owns 46 percent of my State of California and often gives local communities impacted by its lands a dismissive brushoff, which is typical of the experience of our Western States.

In fact, I take this opportunity to ask my colleagues from Massachusetts to consider what would happen to their communities if the Federal Government took over half of the land in their State, removed it from the tax rolls, severely restricted any productive use of that land, and then thumbed its nose at the concerns and complaints of local communities.

Thankfully, this administration has taken a cooperative and supportive position in recent years and has improved conditions greatly, but that doesn't guarantee that future administrations won't revert to the Washington-knows-best approach that has produced no end of problems for the people of our Western States.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING), who is honored to represent the second most beautiful national seashore in America.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 182, to reauthorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chair from the Committee on Natural Resources for yielding, and I thank both of my colleagues from California for supporting this bill.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was created by President Kennedy in 1961. His vision was to preserve the unique landscape of the outer cape for recreation and enjoyment for all Americans forever. Today, more than 4 million people, both Americans and those from around the world, travel to Cape Cod every year to experience the natural beauty and recreation that the Cape Cod National Seashore provides.

However, when the Cape Cod National Seashore was proposed, it presented challenges to residents of Cape Cod unique to locating a national park on a peninsula with a limited area and with very small communities within that area. In many of the communities in the outer cape, the national sea-

shore was designed to occupy as much as 80 percent of the available land, effectively foreclosing other economic development options after the park was established.

While the promise of President Kennedy's vision for the outer cape was realized, with the national seashore drawing millions of people from around the world to the cape, the importance of the advisory commission to the national seashore and its host communities is still important today, as important as it was almost 60 years ago.

The advisory commission was at the heart of President Kennedy's vision for the national seashore, as he recognized that the host communities would need a voice in the national seashore affairs after the park was formed. To this end, it was important that the host communities retained a formal structure to advise seashore leadership and the Park Service about how actions taken within the park would affect them and their communities.

The reasons for the powers granted to the advisory commission in its enabling legislation are just as persuasive today as they were in 1961. Since what happens on the seashore directly affects the lives of thousands of my constituents in the host communities, those decisions should be made with the input of those communities.

Some have suggested that the authority regarding the commercial activity granted to the National Seashore Advisory Commission in its enabling legislation is no longer necessary. This is simply not the case.

Suggestions that the value of having regulatory unity among the national parklands and the various advisory commissions are unpersuasive when one considers the unique nature of Cape Cod. That such a bureaucratic consideration could possibly outweigh the important benefits that the National Seashore Advisory Commission provides to my constituents is just laughable.

Today, just as in the 1960s, the unique nature of the outer cape presents the same challenges to those who live there with respect to the national seashore. The most effective way to address the concerns of the outer cape community is to ensure that a functioning advisory commission is sitting and can continue to play its important role in the community.

Long ago, President Kennedy envisioned what responsible self-governance looks like on the outer cape, a balance between the seashore, the towns, and a place where all parties could come together, again, in the spirit of sustaining the community as a whole. That is the vision of the advisory commission.

Over the past few years, the outer cape region has faced some of its toughest challenges. With climate change, coastal erosion, ocean acidification, and new concerns about sharks in the waters off Cape Cod, Cape Codders are grappling with some of the

most difficult issues that the communities have seen in years. Under these circumstances, the commission's absence is felt every day.

Madam Speaker, that is why I ask my colleagues to support this straightforward piece of legislation, a bill that has been passed by this House in the last Congress that will reactivate an effective tool that has provided an important role for the Cape Cod community, my community, for nearly 60 years.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask for adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I respectfully request an "aye" vote, 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. HUFFMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 182.

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.

BIG BEAR LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 255) to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 255

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 "Big Bear Land Exchange Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COUNTY.**—The term "County" means the County of San Bernardino, California.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "Federal land" means the approximately 73 acres of Federal land administered by the Forest Service generally depicted as "Federal Land Proposed for Exchange" on the Map.

(3) **NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—The term "non-Federal land" means the approximately 71 acres owned by the County generally depicted as "Non-Federal Land Proposed for Exchange" on the Map.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) **MAP.**—The term "Map" means the map titled "Big Bear Land Exchange" and dated August 6, 2018.

SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) **EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.**—Subject to valid existing rights and the terms of this Act, no later than one year after the date that the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail is relocated in accordance with subsection (h), if the County offers to convey the non-Federal land to the United States, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land; and

(2) accept from the County a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the County in and to the non-Federal land.

(b) EQUAL VALUE AND CASH EQUALIZATION.—

(1) **EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.**—The land exchange under this section shall be for equal value, or the values shall be equalized by a cash payment as provided for under this subsection or an adjustment in acreage. At the option of the County, any excess value of the non-Federal lands may be considered a gift to the United States.

(2) **EQUALIZATION.**—If the value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land to be conveyed in a land exchange under this subsection is not equal, the value may be equalized by—

(A) making a cash equalization payment to the Secretary or to the owner of the non-Federal land, as appropriate, in accordance with section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)); or

(B) reducing the acreage of the Federal land or the non-Federal land to be exchanged, as appropriate.

(3) **DEPOSIT AND USE OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM COUNTY.**—Any cash equalization payment received by the Secretary under this subsection shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (16 U.S.C. 484a; commonly known as the "Sisk Act"). The funds so deposited shall remain available to the Secretary, until expended, for the acquisition of lands, waters, and interests in land for the San Bernardino National Forest.

(c) **APPRAISAL.**—The Secretary shall complete an appraisal of the land to be exchanged under subsection (a) in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) **TITLE APPROVAL.**—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the County.

(e) **SURVEY OF NON-FEDERAL LANDS.**—Before completing the exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall inspect the non-Federal lands to ensure that the land meets Federal standards, including hazardous materials and land line surveys.

(f) **COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.**—As a condition of conveyance, any costs related to the exchange under this section shall be paid by the County.

(g) **MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LANDS.**—The non-Federal land acquired by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) added to, and managed as part of, San Bernardino National Forest; and

(2) managed in accordance with—

(A) the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 480 et seq.; commonly known as the "Weeks Act"); and

(B) any other laws, including regulations, pertaining to National Forest System lands.

(h) **PACIFIC CREST NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL RELOCATION.**—Not later than three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and other applicable laws (including regulations), shall relocate the portion of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail located on the Federal land to—

(1) adjacent National Forest System land;

(2) land owned by the County, subject to County approval;

(3) land within the Federal land, subject to County approval; or

(4) a combination of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(i) **MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enact-

ment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize a map and legal descriptions of all land to be conveyed under this Act. The Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map or in the legal descriptions. The map and legal descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(j) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) shall apply to the land exchange authorized under subsection (a).

(k) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Any conveyance of Federal land under this Act shall be subject to—

(1) valid existing rights;

(2) the terms of this Act; and

(3) such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 255, introduced by Representative COOK, would authorize an equal value exchange between the U.S. Forest Service and San Bernardino County. This exchange would enable the county to build a resource conservation and recovery facility. This will increase efficiency and safety of timber processing and recycling in that area. In return, the Forest Service would receive an undeveloped inholding in the San Bernardino National Forest.

The bill is a perfect example of how, through a collaborative process, we can meet the needs of local stakeholders while continuing to protect our environment and public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank my colleague, Representative COOK, for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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