



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2015

No. 86

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 1, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, 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, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today because last night, at midnight, a wonderful thing happened. In what seems like a constant flow, a tide that has been washing away our liberties since the founding of this country, we experienced something unique.

The tide reversed, thanks to one Senator, Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky, and now, we have some of our civil liberties restored. If only but for a brief second in history, they are restored. It

may register only as an eddy current, but clearly, we changed the tide last night.

Now, what happened? The PATRIOT Act expired. How does a law expire, do you say? Why do we allow them to expire? It is because, when we enact laws, we know that we don't have the foresight to see how they will be carried out. We don't know everything that is going to happen as time transpires. It is important that we revisit these laws. In this case, this law expired.

I would like to pretend that, if I were here when the PATRIOT Act passed after the attacks on our country, that I wouldn't have voted for it, but I can't say that. I am not going to pass judgment on my colleagues that were here when it did pass. I can barely imagine the incredible pressure they were under from their constituents, from everybody, to do something—to do something to protect our country, and so they passed the PATRIOT Act. I don't blame them. I wasn't here. I might have done the same thing.

We have new facts today, so we revisit this law; we revisit the PATRIOT Act. What are the new facts? What are the things that have changed since it was issued? Let me list them.

First of all, our Director of National Intelligence lied to us, lied to Congress about how the law was being implemented. In fact, he said, "I said the least untruthful thing I could," when he testified. Those were his words. He said the least untruthful thing he could.

That is not good enough. He is in charge of all of our intelligence, and you are spying on Americans, and you lied to Congress about it, so that has changed.

What else changed? The NSA broke the law. How do we know this? The second highest court in the land said they broke the law. Just a few weeks ago, they ruled this. Surely, we can't trust them to enforce the laws that we are

giving them now without some major reform.

What is the next thing that has changed since the PATRIOT Act first passed? The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence failed us. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is privy to information that the rest of Congress cannot have, and I understand that. It would be hard to keep a secret if 435 Members knew about it, so we entrust some of our Members to know the Nation's most important secrets.

What do we trust them with? Oversight, oversight over the intelligence community to make sure that the laws that all 435 of us vote on are being implemented in the way that we intended them to be implemented—and that was not the case, so that has changed.

What is the fourth thing that has changed since the first PATRIOT Act was issued and the last time it was reauthorized? The FISA court, this is the secret court that issues the secret warrants, if you will—if you would call them warrants. I would not call them warrants.

They issued the mother of all general warrants. What are general warrants? These are warrants that are not specific. The warrant they issued would make King George III blush. Think about this: a warrant that covers every—every—American.

Let me read the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution here, and this is specifically about your right to privacy: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

The warrant that they issued, the one that went to Verizon which authorized the collection of everybody's

☐ 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.

H3583

phone records, was not constitutional; yet we trusted them with the oversight, and they betrayed us. They betrayed that trust.

Since 1979, there have been 34,000 surveillance orders requested of the FISA court by the intelligence community; 12 of the 34,000 have been denied.

Mr. Speaker, things have changed. I urge my colleagues not to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. The Freedom Act does not go far enough.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there is a quiet revolution taking place across America to reform and modernize our marijuana laws. For over half a century, the official position has been one of prohibition, of incarceration, of obfuscation, and willful ignorance; yet almost 20 million Americans use marijuana every month.

A majority of the public now thinks that that should be legal, and an even larger majority thinks that, whatever their personal opinion about marijuana is, that the Federal Government should not interfere with what the States do, just like how we regulate alcohol.

In the vanguard of the reform movement has been medical marijuana since 1996, when California was the first State to legalize it. It has been followed now where almost three-quarters of the States provide some form of access to medical marijuana, and most of those decisions were made by a vote of the people. Well over 200 million Americans live where they have access to medical marijuana.

There have been many positive benefits achieved for our veterans, who suffer from a wide range of medical problems, many of which stem from their years of service: chronic pain, PTSD, controlling the symptoms of multiple sclerosis, or dealing with violent nausea as a result of chemotherapy; yet our veterans are discriminated against because, even in States where it is legal, their VA doctors are discouraged from working with them to see if medical marijuana is right for them or if it is not.

I am pleased to see some change taking place in Congress. We almost passed my amendment last month which would have given veterans fair treatment, enabling their primary doctor to consult with them. Just this last week in the Senate, there was approved in committee essentially the same amendment, and it is on its way to the Senate floor to give equal rights to veterans for medical marijuana.

This is the latest step in the evolution that we have seen now where four States and the District of Columbia have declared adult use legal, and we are seeing further progress at the local level.

The tide is building. We are turning away from a failed program of prohib-

iting; arresting; and, in some cases, incarcerating, while denying the science.

We as a Nation are turning to approaches that are more honest and workable, that tax and regulate to allow for important research and public education that will allow people to make informed choices about the use of these substances or not.

We are already seeing the social, economic, and law enforcement advantages in this shift at the State level, and we should capitalize on this movement at the national level as well.

It is exciting to see a bipartisan group of legislators in a sea of legislative dysfunction coming together to promote bringing this country into the 21st century in terms of marijuana policies, doing it right.

This week, during consideration of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, we are likely to see numerous amendments dealing with research, hemp, medical marijuana, cultivation, enforcement, and respecting States' laws.

This is an exciting and encouraging development to be able to make the Federal Government a full partner with the evolution that is taking place on the State and local level.

I urge my colleagues to vote in such a way that respects the will of the people and the rights of States to forge these new policies.

FISHING IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the American recreational fishermen that, like myself and my family, used to have the opportunity to fish for red snapper in the Federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

I can't help but think how sad it is that we have people in here articulating why illegal drugs should be made legal while we continue to allow Federal agencies to take away the rights of the American sportsmen and the men and the women who just want to take their kids fishing.

Maybe if we spent more time outdoors fishing and hunting, we wouldn't have the problems that we have in this country with drugs.

Now, technically, Mr. Speaker, we still have the right to fish in the Gulf of Mexico in the Federal waters, as long as you can do it in the crumb of the season that has been left for the recreational fishermen.

Dr. Roy Crabtree and the National Marine Fisheries Services have left a 10-day season for the not-for-hire recreational angler who just wants to take his or her kid fishing, 10 days.

In 2007, Mr. Speaker—if you want to know how fast this has gone downhill—we got to fish 194 days; so, in the short span of about 8 years, they have taken 95 percent of the opportunity of the

American sportsmen to fish in the Gulf of Mexico's Federal waters for red snapper away from them.

When they started the reductions, they promised that, as soon as the stock was restored, the season would be restored. Now, they give us the excuse: Well, because there are so many of them and they are so much bigger, you are catching that many that much faster.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this makes no sense. The commercial fishermen, ships, long lines and winches, and their powerful lobbyists, they get to fish year round for the same species. Dr. Roy Crabtree and the others at the National Marine Fisheries Services again virtually eliminated the fishing season for the recreational angler, reducing it to 10 days.

Now, I support the commercial fishing industry. I like to buy a piece of red snapper at the restaurant. I like to buy it at the grocery store. There is plenty of fish out there for all of us.

The 10 days that we have as recreational anglers—if it is bad weather, well, that is just too bad. If you have got to work that day, well, that is just too bad. You see, they pick the days. You don't get to pick the days, Mr. Speaker; and, if you can't fish on that day, that is just too bad for you. If you can afford it, the charter boat season now is 45 days.

Now, I will just tell you, I have never seen this much bias in anything I have ever done, especially in the rulemaking process, unless someone is being bribed or blackmailed or had a personal financial interest in the rulemaking, which brings me to the next point.

The vote to split the recreational season at the expense of the American angler, who just wants to fish with their family—not being forced to hire a charter boat—this was done by the Gulf Council on a split vote of 7 to 10 in which, according to news sources, 3 of the members that voted to do this didn't disclose that they sit on the board of a group that lobbies for the charter boat industry.

Again, I support the charter boat industry, but the idea that someone could sit there and vote to make a season for themselves 45 days as long as you can you pay them to take you, but 10 days if you don't pay them—Mr. Speaker, to be quite honest, Federal law stipulates those with a conflict must disclose it and shall not vote on those issues where a conflict exists.

The conduct of the National Marine Fisheries Services in allowing that vote is in direct contrast to the rights of the Americans who just want to fish in the Gulf of Mexico.

I, for one, am not going to sit back and let this continue; and, when the CJS appropriations act is on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have the opportunity to correct what I believe to be illegal actions by the National Marine Fisheries Services and Dr. Roy Crabtree.

□ 1215

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ODESSA PERMIAN HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM'S FIRST STATE CHAMPIONSHIP TITLE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Odessa Permian High School football team's first State championship title. As a member of that team, I am especially excited to gather with my teammates this weekend to look back over the 50 years.

They say everything is bigger in Texas, and high school football is no different.

Mr. Speaker, when our team earned the title that bitterly cold December day, it was the start of one of the most storied high school football dynasties in Texas. We were led by the Texas coaching legend, Gene Mayfield, who was as tough as his reputation suggests. He was known for his motivational skills, and he could motivate. Coach Mayfield and the coaching staff did not inherit a State-championship-caliber team that year; rather, through his influence and direction, he molded our team into something that many doubted we could ever become.

His emphasis on preparation, competition, and expectation to win drove our team to demand more of each other. We suffered during his notoriously tough workouts. You could find our team running in the sandhills of Monahans Sandhills State Park or challenging each other with bicycle races, wrestling matches, or any of the other various events that he could find that would hone our competitive spirit and build a drive to win and a spirit to never quit.

Mr. Speaker, unbeknownst to us as kids, the values Coach Mayfield was instilling in us that year would carry with us for the rest of our lives. He was teaching us more than how to be good football players; he was teaching us how to become men. I personally view Coach Mayfield as one of the most influential men in my life, and I believe that my teammates would say the same.

It was through our shared experiences that our team bonded together. In 1965, it drove us to win, and we were seeing the fruits of our labors with each game night. Those experiences created relationships that have endured over five decades.

This Friday, my teammates and I will gather to renew those bonds and reminisce, but also to become the recipients of this year's Odessa Permian High School Black Shirt Award. Every year, this award is given to a school organization, individual, or group that have achieved a standard of excellence and inspired a passion in the Permian High School alumni and student body.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been a part of that historic season and to

have played with some of the best teammates you could ever ask for.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Thomas More Garrett, OP, St. Pius V Catholic Church, Providence, Rhode Island, offered the following prayer:

Hear us O God, we pray, that we may begin these summer months refreshed and renewed. Give new vigor to our efforts. Help us to be always mindful of the guiding hand of providence as we seek to better our country and the world at large.

Let us remember that we are not always the best arbiters of our own good, that we can be wrong about what is best for us, and that our own desires can sometimes bring us harm. Confident in Your assistance, we turn to You for Your protection and ask You to save us from the difficulties that we bring upon ourselves.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

COMMEMORATING THE SAMOAN EXILES

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, this month, 72 Samoans who were exiled to my home, the Northern Mariana Is-

lands, will receive the ceremonial farewell they were never given—100 years late.

In 1909, the 72 Samoans were exiled to the Mariana Islands by the Governor of German Samoa, Wilhelm Solf. Their crime: the chiefs had tried to reinstate traditional Samoan practices outlawed by the German colonial regime. The Samoans remained in the Marianas until 1915, when they were repatriated by another colonial power—Japan.

Their story was almost lost in time. But thanks to the work of the Northern Marianas Humanities Council, the history of these exiles has now been documented.

RECOGNIZING OUR AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our American manufacturers. As we work to knock down trade barriers—barriers abroad—so American exporters can sell their products overseas, many opponents of free trade are spreading outright lies: lies about the impact of American trade agreements on American manufacturers.

Whirlpool is a great example, an example that continues to be cited as an American company that has virtually shut down its plants in America because of trade. It is astounding because it is not true.

There are 22,000 American Whirlpool workers. They are makers of iconic brands like Whirlpool, Maytag, and KitchenAid. More than 80 percent of Whirlpool products sold in the United States are made in the United States. Their products come from Ohio communities like Clyde, Marion, Greenville, Ottawa, and Findlay, Ohio, not to mention Whirlpool plants in other States.

Believe the numbers, Mr. Speaker. One in every five jobs in Ohio depends on trade. With new trade agreements, barriers abroad will be removed so Whirlpool and other manufacturers have the opportunity to sell their American-made products overseas.

Let's spread the truth: trade supports American jobs, and increased trade will build a healthy American economy.

PASS A LONG-TERM HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT TRUST FUND BILL

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Michigan, of all States, knows that we need to fix our crumbling roads and bridges if we are going to remain competitive as a nation.

It is long past time, long overdue, for this Congress to rebuild our infrastructure, to pass legislation to fully fund, on an extended basis, the highway and

transit trust fund bill. Unfortunately, instead of working on a big infrastructure bill, last month Congress passed a mere 2-month extension, an extension that gets us no further in repairing our Nation's crumbling infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are fed up with more delays instead of real action on road funding. No city and no State is going to move forward on major projects because Congress extended this fund by 60 days.

No more temporary extensions. No more delays. Let's get to work on a bipartisan, long-term plan to invest in our Nation's roads, our bridges, and our ports. We have to believe in ourselves. We have to bet on the American worker and on American business. If we invest in infrastructure, they will pay us back with productivity.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 3 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 on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING EARLY REPAYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS TO BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 404) to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 404

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

SECTION 1. EARLY REPAYMENT OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (referred to in this section as the

“District”) may repay, at any time, the construction costs of project facilities allocated to the landowner's land within the District.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF FULL-COST PRICING LIMITATIONS.—On discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of all construction costs described in subsection (a) that are allocated to all land the landowner owns in the District in question, the parcels of land shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations under Federal reclamation law (the Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), including the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (13 U.S.C. 390aa et seq.).

(c) CERTIFICATION.—On request of a landowner that has repaid, in full, the construction costs described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the landowner a certificate described in section 213(b)(1) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) modifies any contractual rights under, or amends or reopens, the reclamation contract between the District and the United States; or

(2) modifies any rights, obligations, or relationships between the District and landowners in the District under Nebraska State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

As we begin the debate on this particular bill, I am pleased that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) is here with us to introduce this very effective and important bill.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) to explain his legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding.

Under Federal reclamation law, irrigation districts which receive water from a Bureau of Reclamation facility typically repay their portion of the capital costs of water projects under long-term contracts.

Under its current contract and current law, Northport is exempt from annual capital repayment if this carriage fee exceeds \$8,000 per year. Given that the carriage fee has greatly exceeded this amount every year since the 1950s, Northport's capital repayment debt has been stagnant at over \$923,000 since 1952.

So long as the debt endures, landowners are subject to burdensome reporting requirements and acreage limi-

tations, and no leverage is generated for the Federal Government.

I introduced this bill to provide members of the Northport Irrigation District early repayment authority under their dated reclamation contract.

Allowing producers within the Northport Irrigation District to pay off their portion of the contract means the government will receive funds otherwise uncollected, and landowners will be relieved of costly constraints which threaten family-owned operations.

For example, at a Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee hearing last year, one member of the Northport district testified that acreage limitations will prohibit parents who own land in the district from passing down or even selling farmland to sons and daughters who also own land in the same district.

As the chairman mentioned, similar legislation has passed under bipartisan majorities and, according to the CBO, could generate as much as \$440,000 in Federal revenue.

This is a very simple bill which would make a big difference to some family farmers in western Nebraska.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 404 would authorize landowners served by the Northport Irrigation District to prepay the remaining portion of construction costs allocated to them for the North Platte project. In exchange, the landowners who pay will no longer be subject to acreage limitations and other requirements associated with the Reclamation Reform Act.

I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this good bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This bill is an excellent piece of legislation that solves a problem that should never have existed in the first place.

It is curious that in many cases throughout the West, the current Federal law does not allow a landowner to make an early repayment on Federal irrigation projects. It is an outdated law and a hurdle that is silly. It is similar to a bank prohibiting a homeowner from paying off his or her mortgage early.

Congressman SMITH's bill removes the Federal Bureau of Reclamation repayment prohibition for individual landowners within the Northport Irrigation District. In return for those payments, though, these farmers will no longer be subject to the acreage limitation and the paperwork requirements imposed by the Reclamation Reform Act.

This bill will accelerate revenue coming into the Treasury. It is based on two recent precedents that passed in both Republican- and Democrat-controlled Houses. Today, we are trying to continue those efforts by adopting this particular bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, 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. 404.

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.

NATIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN'S SAFETY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1168) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1168

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 "Native American Children's Safety Act".

SEC. 2. CRIMINAL RECORDS CHECKS.

Section 408 of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act (25 U.S.C. 3207) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) BY TRIBAL SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY FOR FOSTER CARE PLACEMENTS IN TRIBAL COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' includes—

"(i) any individual 18 years of age or older; and

"(ii) any individual who the tribal social services agency determines is subject to a criminal records check under paragraph (2)(A).

"(B) FOSTER CARE PLACEMENT.—The term 'foster care placement' means any action removing an Indian child from a parent or Indian custodian for temporary placement in a foster home or institution or the home of a guardian or conservator if—

"(i) the parent or Indian custodian cannot have the child returned on demand; and

"(ii)(I) parental rights have not been terminated; or

"(II) parental rights have been terminated but the child has not been permanently placed.

"(C) INDIAN CUSTODIAN.—The term 'Indian custodian' means any Indian—

"(i) who has legal custody of an Indian child under tribal law or custom or under State law; or

"(ii) to whom temporary physical care, custody, and control has been transferred by the parent of the child.

"(D) PARENT.—The term 'parent' means—

"(i) any biological parent of an Indian child; or

"(ii) any Indian who has lawfully adopted an Indian child, including adoptions under tribal law or custom.

"(E) TRIBAL COURT.—The term 'tribal court' means a court—

"(i) with jurisdiction over foster care placements; and

"(ii) that is—

"(I) a Court of Indian Offenses;

"(II) a court established and operated under the code or custom of an Indian tribe; or

"(III) any other administrative body of an Indian tribe that is vested with authority over foster care placements.

"(F) TRIBAL SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY.—The term 'tribal social services agency' means the agency of an Indian tribe that has the primary responsibility for carrying out foster care licensing or approval (as of the date on which the proceeding described in paragraph (2)(A) commences) for the Indian tribe.

"(2) CRIMINAL RECORDS CHECK BEFORE FOSTER CARE PLACEMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), no foster care placement shall be finally approved and no foster care license shall be issued until the tribal social services agency—

"(i) completes a criminal records check of each covered individual who resides in the household or is employed at the institution in which the foster care placement will be made; and

"(ii) concludes that each covered individual described in clause (i) meets such standards as the Indian tribe shall establish in accordance with subparagraph (B).

"(B) STANDARDS OF PLACEMENT.—The standards described in subparagraph (A)(ii) shall include—

"(i) requirements that each tribal social services agency described in subparagraph (A)—

"(I) perform criminal records checks, including fingerprint-based checks of national crime information databases (as defined in section 534(f)(3) of title 28, United States Code);

"(II) check any abuse registries maintained by the Indian tribe; and

"(III) check any child abuse and neglect registry maintained by the State in which the covered individual resides for information on the covered individual, and request any other State in which the covered individual resided in the preceding 5 years, to enable the tribal social services agency to check any child abuse and neglect registry maintained by that State for such information; and

"(ii) any other additional requirement that the Indian tribe determines is necessary and permissible within the existing authority of the Indian tribe, such as the creation of voluntary agreements with State entities in order to facilitate the sharing of information related to the performance of criminal records checks.

"(C) RESULTS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), no foster care placement shall be ordered in any proceeding described in subparagraph (A) if an investigation described in clause (i) of that subparagraph reveals that a covered individual described in that clause has been found by a Federal, State, or tribal court to have committed any crime listed in clause (i) or (ii) of section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)).

"(3) EMERGENCY PLACEMENT.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to an emergency foster care placement, as determined by a tribal social services agency.

"(4) RECERTIFICATION OF FOSTER HOMES OR INSTITUTIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, each Indian tribe shall establish procedures to recertify homes or institutions in which foster care placements are made.

"(B) CONTENTS.—The procedures described in subparagraph (A) shall include, at a minimum, periodic intervals at which the home or institution shall be subject to recertification to ensure—

"(i) the safety of the home or institution for the Indian child; and

"(ii) that each covered individual who resides in the home or is employed at the institution is subject to a criminal records check in accordance with this subsection, including any covered individual who—

"(I) resides in the home or is employed at the institution on the date on which the procedures established under subparagraph (A) commences; and

"(II) did not reside in the home or was not employed at the institution on the date on which the investigation described in paragraph (2)(A)(i) was completed.

"(C) GUIDANCE ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY.—The procedures established under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to any regulation or guidance issued by the Secretary that is in accordance with the purpose of this subsection.

"(5) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection and after consultation with Indian tribes, the Secretary shall issue guidance regarding—

"(A) procedures for a criminal records check of any covered individual who—

"(i) resides in the home or is employed at the institution in which the foster care placement is made after the date on which the investigation described in paragraph (2)(A)(i) is completed; and

"(ii) was not the subject of an investigation described in paragraph (2)(A)(i) before the foster care placement was made;

"(B) self-reporting requirements for foster care homes or institutions in which any covered individual described in subparagraph (A) resides if the head of the household or the operator of the institution has knowledge that the covered individual—

"(i) has been found by a Federal, State, or tribal court to have committed any crime listed in clause (i) or (ii) of section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)); or

"(ii) is listed on a registry described in clause (II) or (III) of paragraph (2)(B)(i);

"(C) promising practices used by Indian tribes to address emergency foster care placement procedures under paragraph (3); and

"(D) procedures for certifying compliance with this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the sponsor of this excellent piece of legislation, to explain his bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his good work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress, while I served on the Natural Resources Committee, we held an oversight hearing regarding the child protection crisis on the Spirit Lake Indian Reservation in North Dakota in response to the numerous child deaths, as well as whistleblower reports that were detailing unsafe tribal placement of almost 40 foster children in abusive homes, many of which were headed by known convicted child sex offenders.

In an effort to protect these children and children around the country, I introduced the Native American Children's Safety Act, a bill that Senator JOHN HOEVEN of North Dakota has also introduced in the United States Senate.

This bill implements across-the-board minimum protections for children placed in foster care at the direction of a tribal court. These standards, Mr. Speaker, mirror existing national requirements for nontribal foster care placements, ensuring that tribal children receive at least the same, if not higher, standards of foster care as nontribal children placed in foster care.

This bill is bipartisan. I believe it is noncontroversial. It was reported out of the Natural Resources Committee in both this Congress and the last Congress with unanimous consent.

I also want to take the time to thank several members of the administration, particularly the BIA, as well as Health and Human Services, for their assistance in refining the bill. I also want to thank the National Indian Child Welfare Association, which assisted in refining the bill, as well as the National Congress of American Indians.

All of these refinements to the bill help make the bill better. More importantly, it provides flexibility to the tribes in fulfilling the obligations of the bill, and I think it makes it a much better bill.

I thank everybody who was involved, as well as my colleagues, and hope that we can pass it without objection today.

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

Currently, Native America tribes and their tribal courts use procedures and guidelines that vary significantly from tribe to tribe when placing a Native American child in a foster home.

Current law does not require that the Federal Government or Indian tribe perform vigorous background checks on foster parents or foster homes in order to ensure the safety, health, and protection of Native children.

Consequently, there have been appalling cases of Native American children ending up in dangerous and unsafe living conditions because they were placed in an overburdened foster care system that failed to ensure sufficient background checks of placement homes. We critically need background checks of individuals and institutions selected to foster Native youth.

H.R. 1168 strengthens background checks on prospective foster care parents prior to placement of Native chil-

dren into foster homes and sets forth a uniform manner in which Federal and tribal agencies serving tribes may conduct such checks.

I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support of Native American children by supporting passage of Mr. CRAMER's bill, H.R. 1168, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been fully explained. To protect Indian foster children and provide these background checks is a wonderful thing. It is well overdue. I appreciate and commend the gentleman from North Dakota, and 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. 1168.

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.

REVOCATION OF MIAMI TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA CHARTER

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 533) to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 533

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

SECTION 1. REVOCATION OF CHARTER OF INCORPORATION.

The request of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to surrender the charter of incorporation issued to that tribe and ratified by its members on June 1, 1940, pursuant to the Act of June 26, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 501 et seq.; commonly known as the "Oklahoma Welfare Act"), is hereby accepted and that charter of incorporation is hereby revoked.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have another piece of legislation that does wonderful

things. It should have been done earlier than this, but this time we are going to get it all the way through the system.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) to explain his legislation.

Mr. MULLIN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

The Miami Tribe's current charter of incorporation is an outdated governing structure that harms business and economic development. We wrote this bill because these charters can only be removed literally by an act of Congress.

The Miami Tribe has said that the outdated charter is inoperable. It imposes restrictions on business operations that are unmanageable and unnecessary.

Oklahoma is known for its entrepreneurial spirit, especially among our State's tribes. It is important that Congress remove these hurdles for investors, business partners, and potential customers.

As lawmakers, it is our job in Congress to foster an atmosphere that promotes economic growth across the country. I take this responsibility very seriously, and I hope that you will join me today in eliminating a needless economic burden on the Miami Tribe in my home State of Oklahoma.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, H.R. 533 simply revokes a corporate charter issued to it by the Federal Government.

Under the Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act and the Indian Reorganization Act, many tribes were issued corporate charters in the 1930s and 1940s that were aimed at enabling them to better manage their own affairs and pursue business relationships with private entities.

For some tribes, these corporate charters have proven unnecessary and end up hindering their business opportunities, as they will inevitably come up in negotiations with private entities and are looked upon with suspicion.

The charter must be revoked by an act of Congress, and Mr. MULLIN, on behalf of his constituents, is simply being a good Congressman and complying with the tribe's request through this bill.

Similar legislation has passed over the years without event, and I ask my colleagues to stand with me in support of Mr. MULLIN's noncontroversial bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me say just a few words about this particular piece legislation by myself. It is a one-page piece of legislation that should be easy to read—and those are always dangerous because they are easy to read—that grants the request from the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to revoke a charter of incorporation which was issued back in the New Deal era—a 1936 law that was implemented

in 1940. And as we know, any of those pieces of legislation that age that well have got to be reviewed at a specific period of time.

Right now, we have a situation in which this tribe funds itself in a cumbersome situation with an outdated document that puts on limitations and uncertainty in the tribe business when they don't have to, because they are dealing instead with the business activities that come through their tribal constitution.

They are doing it the right way. And unfortunately, it requires an act of Congress to allow them to do what they ought to be doing and are doing in the first place and just clean up this act. So only we can do that.

It is in accordance with the tribal wishes, and it is in accordance with Congressman MULLIN, who represents this particular tribe in the House. He has sponsored this. This is a good bill. The Department of the Interior does not object to this piece of legislation. An identical version passed in the House in the 113th Congress by a voice vote. I would hope we would do it again, and this time make sure we go all the way through the system and do what is right for this particular tribe.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak very slowly as I am waiting for someone else to show up on the next bill and would, therefore, yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) for another couple of anecdotes as to why this piece of legislation is needed. I will tug on the gentleman's coat when he shows up and he can quit.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, you know, this is a piece of legislation that unfortunately we have tried 2½ years, way too long, to try to get through this body; but it also opens an important conversation about taking a look at all of these charters.

Why is it that Congress has to come together to pass commonsense legislation that should be up to the tribes themselves to make the decision? When they are hindering the businesses and the atmosphere that these tribes are able to operate under, they are not able to go out and provide jobs to not just their members but, also, to the communities which they live in and they thrive in.

Miami Tribe is a large employer of the city of Miami. The city of Miami has been in a situation where they have lost two major employers, and they look to these tribes like this in the community to create not just jobs at a casino, but manufacturing jobs, jobs that help our national defense. Yet they are hindered constantly by the effect that they can't simply do the work without asking Congress' permission.

They are a sovereign nation. Why is it that they would have to continue to

come back on something that isn't needed, something that dates all the way back to the 1930s? Unfortunately, this is exactly where we find ourselves today.

I am so glad that this is actually one of those things that is a bipartisan approach. Common sense does prevail in these Halls sometimes when we can come together and we can work at something that is noncontroversial. Even at that, we started this in the 113th Congress; and now we are in the 114th Congress, and we are still talking about it. We are 6 months into the 114th Congress, and we are trying to get a commonsense piece of legislation passed.

If I remember correctly, last year, when we tried to put this through, there was only one "no" vote. If that is not bipartisanship, then, what is? This should have been on the President's desk already.

So I join my colleagues in supporting this bill, but I also want to thank them for their patience, for the city of Miami and the tribe of Miami for their patience and the opportunity to bring this up again.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to break any protocols we may have. So, therefore, I want to echo what the gentleman from Oklahoma so brilliantly and so fluently and obviously not slowly enough said.

With that, Mr. Speaker, once again, we will go through this concept that hopefully—does the gentleman from Virginia, even though I realize he has yielded back, would the gentleman like some of my time?

Mr. BEYER. I would be happy to take some if the chairman wouldn't mind.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Bless you.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my gratitude to the Congressman from Oklahoma for teaching me how to say "Miami." I have been mispronouncing "Miami" all through my short presentation. I also want to thank him for his leadership and being so responsive.

I think that there are perhaps many other laws on the books that we should look at in a very simple way to revoke the charters, as necessary.

I would also like to offer my help to the Congressman from Miami with our two Virginia Senators. It sounds like, if it passed this House with only one negative vote last year, that perhaps the Senate is the place where this is being held up. If we can provide some support to him in his moving this through the Senate side, I would be delighted to do that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good piece of legislation. I want to thank Mr. MULLIN for bringing it up.

While we are on the subject, I would like to talk about the necessity of ICWA, the Child Welfare Act of this Congress past which I was a sponsor of.

The gentleman is here. So we won't talk about ICWA today. We will just let Mr. MCCLINTOCK get in here and make his statement. Eventually, Mr. Speaker, I will talk about the foster care homes, the need for volunteers, so we don't have 300 children in my State staying with State supervision instead of adopted. So we will talk about that later.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, with great appreciation to my good friends from Oklahoma and Virginia and Alaska, 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. 533.

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.

DESIGNATING A MOUNTAIN IN THE JOHN MUIR WILDERNESS AS SKY POINT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 979) to designate a mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest as "Sky Point".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 979

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

- (1) Staff Sergeant Sky Mote, USMC, grew up in El Dorado, California.
- (2) Staff Sergeant Mote graduated from Union Mine High School.
- (3) Upon graduation, Staff Sergeant Mote promptly enlisted in the Marine Corps.
- (4) Staff Sergeant Mote spent 9 years serving his country in the United States Marine Corps, including a deployment to Iraq and two deployments to Afghanistan.
- (5) By his decisive actions, heroic initiative, and resolute dedication to duty, Staff Sergeant Mote gave his life to protect fellow Marines on August 10, 2012, by gallantly rushing into action during an attack by a rogue Afghan policeman inside the base perimeter in Helmand province.
- (6) Staff Sergeant Mote was awarded the Navy Cross, a Purple Heart, the Navy-Marine Corps Commendation Medal, a Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal, 2 Combat Action Ribbons and 3 Good Conduct Medals.
- (7) The Congress of the United States, in acknowledgment of this debt that cannot be repaid, honors Staff Sergeant Mote for his ultimate sacrifice and recognizes his service to his country, faithfully executed to his last, full measure of devotion.
- (8) A presently unnamed peak in the center of Humphrey Basin holds special meaning to

the friends and family of Sky Mote, as their annual hunting trips set up camp beneath this point; under the stars, the memories made beneath this rounded peak will be cherished forever.

SEC. 2. SKY POINT.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The mountain in the John Muir Wilderness of the Sierra National Forest in California, located at 37°15'16.10091"N 118°43'39.54102"W, shall be known and designated as "Sky Point".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the mountain described in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to "Sky Point".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

There are some times when we can do nothing to repay the sacrifice that our fellow men have done for us; but, in some small way, we can try to show our gratitude. This is one bill that does that.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the sponsor of this piece of legislation.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote cared about a lot of things—his fellow Marines, his country, his family, his community—but his father, Russell, recalled, "He never cared about medals. He never showed them to us. Once," he said, "I found one in his laundry."

The irony is that Staff Sergeant Sky Mote received the second highest medal that our country can bestow upon a Marine, the Navy Cross, for his heroism in defending his fellow Marines on the last day of his life, August 10, 2012.

The Navy Cross is in addition to the Purple Heart, the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, two Combat Action Ribbons, and three Good Conduct Medals that he earned during his 9 years of exemplary service to our Nation.

In the U.S. Marine Corps, that prides itself on maintaining the highest standards of the American military tradition, Staff Sergeant Sky Mote stands conspicuously above and beyond.

On that day, that last day of his life, Sergeant Mote was at his post in the tactical operations center of the 1st Marine Special Operations Battalion in Helmand province. On that day, a so-called Afghan police officer opened fire on the Marines who had come there to help that country.

When the attack broke out, Sergeant Mote was in an adjoining room. He could have easily escaped to safety. According to the Navy's citation, "He instead grabbed his M4 rifle and entered the operations room, courageously exposing himself to a hail of gunfire in order to protect his fellow Marines. In his final act of bravery, he boldly engaged the gunman, now less than 5 meters in front of him, until falling mortally wounded."

According to the citation, it was Mote's actions that stopped the attack and forced the attacker to flee. It was this heroism for which he received the Navy Cross.

We know that he didn't care much about medals, but he cared so deeply about his Marine Corps brothers that he gave his life for them. Many who would have perished that day will go on to lead long and productive and prosperous lives because Sky Mote sacrificed his own for them, as did Captain Matthew Manoukian of Los Altos Hills, California, who also gave his life to defend his fellow Marines that day.

Staff Sergeant Mote and his unit had been in the thick of the fighting in Afghanistan, often functioning as a commando force. During their tour in Puzeh, he and his unit were often engaged in daylong firefights, and Mote in particular had often exposed himself to grave danger.

His family didn't know a lot of this at the time. His stepmother, Marcia, said: "He'd always say, 'I'm going to be on a camping trip' or 'I'm going to go on a hike.' He didn't want to give us any reason to worry."

His father said that, although his son was indifferent to medals, he was intentionally proud of his EOD badge designating his service as an explosive ordnance disposal technician.

Russell Mote explained: "He was just a humble person doing his job, and his job was to protect his team. He was not like a gung ho military person. You wouldn't know he was in the Special Forces."

To the EOD technicians, bombs are not something to be avoided, but something to be sought out and disarmed. On one such day, Mote defused two IEDs; crawled through a heavily seeded minefield to save the life of his team leader, who had been severely wounded by a third; and then directed the evacuation of his unit. On that day, Sergeant Mote had earned a Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with a V for valor.

On another very different day nearly 3 years ago, Sergeant Mote returned home for the last time. Thousands of his countrymen stretched out more than a mile on El Dorado Hills Boule-

vard to silently express their gratitude and respect for this hometown hero.

Hundreds more lined overpasses to pay their respects along the motorcade route. Still more stood silent vigil in front of Silva Valley Elementary School and Rolling Hills Middle School, where he had attended, as the procession passed by. A thousand more waited for him at the church.

Many knew him by his deeds; a fortunate few knew him as a person and recounted stories of his growing up in that community. His father recalled: "Sky loved life, family, and friends, and he loved being a Marine. He loved to surf. He loved to hunt and hike in the Sierra."

Marcia perhaps put it best when she said: "He was just everybody's friend, and he would do anything for anybody."

Sky Mote was 27 on that fateful day in Afghanistan. He was born June 6, 1985, in Bishop, California. When he was still young, his parents divorced, and his father brought his children to El Dorado. He married Marcia, and there, they raised Sky and their four other sons.

There, Sky joined the 4-H. He raised pigs and rode horses. He joined the Civil Air Patrol. At Union Mine High School, he lettered in track and cross country. He camped and biked and hiked with his family throughout the Sierra.

From the time he was a child, he spoke of some day joining the military and defending his country. Right after graduation in 2003, he did just that. Nine years later, he returned home to be laid to rest by a country that honors him, a hometown that remembers him, and a family that misses him.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share a little of what I learned about Marine Staff Sergeant Sky Mote because it helps to answer the question that James Michener first asked: "Where do we get such men?"

Well, we get them from the heart and soul of America. We get them from good and decent families like the Motes. We get them from little towns like El Dorado, California.

We come here today, to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to try to honor a hero who didn't care much about medals. Lincoln, at Gettysburg, noted our difficulty in doing so when he looked over the quiet battlefield and noted that "in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here have consecrated it far beyond our poor power to add or detract."

□ 1530

But nevertheless, we try.

Lincoln was right: we cannot add to the honor of his deeds. We come, instead, to draw inspiration from them. We reflect on a young life, with all the hopes and joys and aspirations of a long and productive lifetime ahead, all sacrificed for a country that, to this

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

same experiences see things differently. For the record, I would like to correct the ranking member. While he is correct that the Magnuson bill that eventually became public law, H.R. 4946, passed the House under suspension of the rules, the original bill which passed the Natural Resources Committee, H.R. 5018, passed after a very long markup, with a vote of 26–15, with only four Democrats voting in favor of the bill. The gentleman from Arizona voted against the bill and signed dissenting views with six other Democrats. So this point that the previous reauthorization acts were non-controversial and nonpartisan is not true. I think whoever wrote that for the gentleman ought to, again, do a little correct history.

Mr. Chairman, as one who sponsored this bill way back in 1975, and it became law in 1976, 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. And to have someone try to hijack this legislation by interest groups when all those involved—the fishermen, the recreational, the commercial, the restaurants, the conservationists that know fisheries, the State of Alaska and all other States—support the Magnuson Act and the improvements we have made in this bill—yes, we have some flexibility.

The bill would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Act, the premier law, as I mentioned before. 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. The councils provide a regional or constituent-based approach.

Remember, this is not about the government. This bill was written by this Congress for the people, not NOAA, not NMSA, not the State Department, not the Sierra Club, and not the Pew group. It was written for fishermen for sustainable yields of fish for the communities. It provides a regional concept. It is critical to the protection of coastal economies and for allowing the stakeholders to be part of the management of the fisheries.

To address the ever-changing needs of fisheries and fishing communities—and I have been through this thing four times from the original to today—the 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 for habitat, improvements for fisheries science, and reductions in bycatch. These were the issues of the time, and they were addressed as needed. A factor of that time also included the lack of resources to fund stock assessments to provide needed data to the regional fishery management councils, some-

thing that continues to be an issue today.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of decisions are made without science. The act was last amended in 2007. Congress included measures to 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. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, we have now reached the point where overfishing has effectively ended in this country.

H.R. 1335 started being developed 4 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. 1335 follows a middle road.

While many today may complain the bill's flexibility rolls back scientific protections, that 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 at levels where overfishing will not occur. The regional councils will continue to follow recommendations of their Science and Statistical Committee.

Mr. Chairman, 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, the 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 cornerstone of the law. The Magnuson-Stevens Act promotes regional flexibility recognizing differing ocean conditions, variations in regional fisheries, different harvesting methods and management techniques, and distinct community impacts.

Again, I want to stress this, Mr. Chairman. This bill was written for fish and communities, not all these other interest groups. As I said in the Rules Committee, 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 fisheries and the healthy concept of our communities for other reasons and other causes. If you want to do that, do it in an independent legislation. We don't need any ocean antiquity acts.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, we don't need any sanctuaries in this bill. We don't need some outside groups telling the fishermen, the com-

munities, and the scientists—it is our belief—when they know little about it.

I happen to have the largest coastline in the whole of the United States all put together, and we have done the job we should be able to do. This bill makes this job easier for the United States of America for giving us the ability to have a sustainable yield of fish and the communities to be taken care of.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished chairman, Mr. YOUNG, that the Magnuson Act is working and that we should leave it alone and allow it to work. The inclusion of previous reauthorizations of the Alaskan model, science-based, has been a key reason why it continues to work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), my colleague.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1335, which would undermine the proven and effective management of our Nation's fisheries. For nearly 40 years, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, MSA, has worked to protect America's fisheries and coastal economies. In more recent years, it has established programs to protect and restore depleted fish stocks, ensuring these resources will be around for years to come. And, Mr. Chairman, these programs are working. In fact, last year marked the lowest number of fishery stocks subject to overfishing or overfished.

Ensuring that fish stocks are healthy is essential to the long-term success of the fishing industry and to food and job security. But protecting and restoring these stocks require that we both acknowledge the need to manage our fisheries and fund the science necessary to properly assess their health. Unfortunately, H.R. 1335 does just the opposite.

Instead of working in a bipartisan manner to improve and modernize MSA, H.R. 1335 would dismiss and roll back existing effective management efforts. It would weaken proven management standards. It would reduce the efficacy of fish stock rebuilding programs, and it will undermine existing laws that work in concert with MSA to protect our fisheries. And it would create gaping loopholes that allow for overfishing and mismanagement under the guise of increasing flexibility. These misguided provisions would threaten the viability of an entire industry and harm the health of our oceans simply to benefit a few special interests.

Mr. Chairman, effective fishery management ensures a sustainable industry by accounting for uncertainty and environmental change. And MSA works

hand in hand with other environmental legislation to ensure the long-term viability of fishery resources. Yet H.R. 1335 needlessly unravels this well-balanced system by undercutting other existing protections under key long-standing laws like the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, like the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

Mr. Chairman, there is bipartisan agreement on the need to protect and promote America's fishermen and the fishing industry, but rather than building on what is already working under current law, this bill would gut the proven management system that is currently in place.

We should work together and be striving to enhance smart, effective management and provide the resources our Nation's fishing communities are asking for. H.R. 1335 is shortsighted and counterproductive, and I urge all my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) to further speak about a position or an issue that has the support of the recreation community and the industry at the same time, which is unique. He is one of the senior members of our committee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, as co-chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act, and would like to thank my colleagues, Chairman ROB BISHOP and Subcommittee Chairman DON YOUNG, for all their efforts to bring this important piece of legislation to the House floor for a vote.

Mr. Chairman, according to the latest report released by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in 2012, the U.S. domestic seafood industry had a sales impact of \$141 billion and supported approximately 1.3 million jobs. H.R. 1335 makes the necessary reforms to support these jobs and our fishermen by promoting better science and requiring State and local data to be considered in Federal decisionmaking about fisheries.

Last year I spoke with commercial fishermen from the Pacific Coast, Atlantic Coast, and the Gulf of Mexico, and the common theme in our discussions was the need for better data and scientific analysis to improve management.

The U.S. has a long and profitable heritage in fishing. To continue that heritage, we need to have quality, diverse data and scientific analysis to facilitate educated decisionmaking on fishery management. H.R. 1335 allows for just that.

Mr. Chairman, the bill increases transparency and provides much-needed flexibility in the law for fishery managers to properly consider the environmental and economic impacts of decisions affecting fishing communities. And it is important to note that

H.R. 1335 makes all of these key reforms to fisheries management without authorizing any new additional Federal spending. We can do the job with the existing resources.

This bill also makes great strides in the saltwater recreational fisheries. Saltwater recreational fishing alone has a \$70 billion impact on our Nation's economy and supports over 454,000 jobs. Marinas, grocery stores, restaurants, motels, lodges, tackle shops, boat dealerships, clothing manufacturers, gas stations, and a host of other businesses and entities benefit from the money spent by recreational anglers.

□ 1600

This industry does not just impact coastal communities but enables job creation and robust economic development in a variety of regions across the country.

Improving recreational data collection and a transparent review of allocations in the Southeast are all great tools that H.R. 1335 gives NOAA to effectively manage a recreational industry that is a significant economic player in the United States economy.

H.R. 1335 is widely supported by a coalition of sportsmen and conservation groups, including the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and the Center for Coastal Conservation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1335 in support of access to our Nation's resources and the 1.3 million jobs that are supported by fishing.

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

In addition to more than 100 commercial and recreational fishing groups and related businesses that have all opposed this legislation from the Atlantic Coast, Pacific Coast, the Gulf of Mexico, and related fishery and commercial areas, John Sackton, Seafood News, a respected market analyst for seafood, said that this act is a "recipe for overfishing, unsustainability, and would move U.S. world-class fisheries management backwards."

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee for the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1335, legislation that is very important to reauthorize the historically bipartisan Magnuson-Stevens Act.

While I have nothing but the utmost respect for my colleague from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), I am afraid that I fear that this legislation would take our fisheries management system in the wrong direction.

The bottom line is Magnuson-Stevens is working today. U.S. fisheries have been remarkably successful since the last reauthorization in 2007, and if it isn't broken, why should we try to fix it?

According to NOAA, 37 important fish stocks have been rebuilt to

healthy population levels since 2000, and the number of stocks subject to overfishing has been cut nearly in half since 2006.

H.R. 1335 would eliminate critical conservation tools that have been essential to our recent success and would also undermine critical environmental laws like the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. I hope that we can work towards a compromise so that Magnuson-Stevens can be reauthorized in a bipartisan manner, as the last two bills were. Until then, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 1335.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), another great worker and a member of our committee.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would, first of all, like to thank the bill's sponsor, our colleague from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), for his continued leadership on this important issue. Additionally, I commend Chairman BISHOP for ensuring that this bill has gone through regular order while being considered by the Natural Resources Committee.

H.R. 1335 makes necessary improvements to the Magnuson-Stevens Act. As you know, Mr. Chairman, our U.S. commercial fishermen generated \$5.1 billion in revenue between 2012 and 2014, and I know that with these necessary changes and improvements our fishermen will be able to contribute even more to our economy.

In addition to the impact that H.R. 1335 has had on our commercial fishing industry, this legislation also has a strong impact on the recreational side of the industry. For an industry that generates \$58 billion in sales while supporting nearly 400,000 jobs, H.R. 1335 encourages our local professionals to have a more active role in determining regulatory measures rather than the one-size-fits-all management approach that has been used in the past.

Furthermore, H.R. 1335 will also adjust the method of counting red snapper mortality. This is an important issue for the recreational fishermen because it will increase access to the waters in the Gulf of Mexico so that our Nation's sportsmen have the ability to enjoy our natural resources while making valuable contributions to the economy at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation has been crafted in a delicate way to ensure the necessary balance between our commercial and recreational fishermen. Both sides of the fishing industry will benefit from this bill and provide our States with more input.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1335.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1335, the Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization before us today.

Management of fisheries in the United States is extremely important, especially in my home State of New Jersey, where the fishing industry is an important economic driver of the State's economy, generating billions of dollars a year in revenue and supporting tens of thousands of jobs.

This bill passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee without a single Democratic vote, and President Obama has threatened to veto it. This doesn't need to be a partisan issue. We should be working together in a bipartisan fashion to make commonsense reforms to Magnuson-Stevens.

There are important fishery management reforms in this bill that I strongly support, such as the flexibility language and modifications to the annual catch limit requirements. However, I am troubled by the language in the bill that makes unnecessary changes to NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and the Antiquities Act.

This bill would vest much of the authority over these statutes in the fishery management councils instead of with the appropriate Federal agency. It is not appropriate to vest regulatory authority for these purposes in a body like a fishery management council.

Fishery managers play an important role in crafting fishery management measures in consultation with NOAA fisheries. Yet, they lack the expertise to appropriately review and analyze the impacts and requirements of NEPA or the Endangered Species Act.

The legislation, Mr. Chairman, does include specific language I authored on recreational data collection, and I would like to thank the authors for including this important section. The goal of this language is to ensure the fishery management councils are collecting the best information possible about recreational fishing. It would implement a grant program to allow States to improve recreational data collection and require the National Research Council to issue a report on improvements that have been made and need to be made with recreational fishing data collection and surveying. This will help us understand what is actually happening with fishing in any given year and ensure that we aren't needlessly closing healthy fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, there are positive reforms to Magnuson-Stevens in this legislation, but unfortunately it weakens important environmental laws such as NEPA and the ESA in the process. I think that is unfortunate. I wish we could have had a bipartisan bill that actually reforms Magnuson-Stevens in a preferable way.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey joining us here. I have to admit

in somewhat chagrin, I quoted you earlier in my speech when you were saying something very positive about this bill last time around. But I would also like to state for the record the concept of the Garden State Seafood Association, which is from your home State of New Jersey and which also supports this bill, as they had said simply that it adjusts "certain specific problematic regulations that have not proven to function as intended since they were added or amended in the last reauthorization a decade ago."

There are problems with the status quo this bill fixes.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), also a farm worker of our committee, and with appreciation for an amendment that he added in committee that made a significant impact, especially for the recreational fisheries of America.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for including my amendment in support of the findings of the Morris-Deal Commission.

One of the top priorities of the Morris-Deal Commission was requiring a review, and adjustment if warranted, of the allocations of mixed-sector fisheries.

Despite the tremendous importance that allocation decisions have in maximizing the benefits that our fisheries provide to the Nation, Federal fisheries managers have refused to revisit allocations—most of which were determined decades ago—primarily because of a lack of clear guidance on how decisions should be made and because these decisions are inherently difficult.

My amendment included in the committee text would prompt the development of criteria that should be considered in allocation decisions and require periodic allocation reviews. The language does not prescribe any specific shifts in existing allocations but rather a science-based review and potential adjustment if needed.

Recognizing the high number of important recreational fisheries in the region, the geographic scope of this provision is limited to just the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico.

You see the poster beside me. As vice chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I represent 1.3 million anglers in the organizations on this poster that they belong to that support this bill.

Let us be clear: the goal here is to allow more fishermen, whether they are commercial fishermen or recreational anglers, to be able to take more fish in a responsible manner. We want policy based on sound science compatible with the facts in the water,

not the uninformed opinions of an agenda-driven desk jockey bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.

This provision was in the MSA reauthorization bills introduced by Senators RUBIO and Begich in the 113th Congress.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee for helping include this language, and I urge passage of the final bill. This is common sense to reauthorize Magnuson-Stevens. The gentleman from Alaska has done a tremendous job on this, and I urge passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for the time.

I rise to support the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, but not the bill we have before us today.

Like many of my colleagues here in Congress who represent coastal States, I know the importance of a vibrant fishery and the importance of Federal policy in this area that keeps our Nation's fisheries moving forward. I live on a small offshore island, and many of my neighbors make their living as fishermen, as do many of my constituents.

The most lucrative fishery in my area is for lobsters, and it is one of the most successful and sustainable fisheries in America because lobstermen and -women have taken the long-term view.

It is so successful and so sustainable because it has been carefully regulated for decades. Strict rules have led to bigger and bigger catches and rising income for fishermen.

This fishery is proof that building a strong fishery happens first by ensuring there is a resource for fishermen to harvest.

Iconic species like haddock and pollock have been devastated by overfishing. They can still make a comeback, but not if we turn our backs on them and the fishermen who depend on them.

The collapse of many of these fisheries has taken its toll on fishing families and fishing communities, but slowly rebuilding these species is rebuilding our hope for the future.

Now is not the time to abandon these efforts. Now is not the time to give up on the progress we have already made.

The only way to guarantee healthy fishing communities over the long term is to rebuild the fish stocks using science-based methods, and I would ask my colleagues to support more funding for science.

The future of many coastal communities is based on sustainable fisheries, not rolling back management systems that give just a few fishermen a short-term boost.

I urge my colleagues to support many of the amendments that will be on the floor this afternoon that will try to improve this legislation, and I urge a "no" vote on the underlying bill.

□ 1615

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), another hard-working member of our committee.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, there are probably almost as many boats as people in my district, and that is because I represent one of the most beautiful stretches of the Atlantic Ocean, from north to south, the southern part of the Jersey Shore.

I have thousands of charter and commercial fishermen and tens of thousands of recreational fishermen who either make their living from the sea or get some respite and go out and do some recreational fishing.

I hear from them all the time that the current Magnuson-Stevens Act is simply not working any more for them. It is outdated. It is arbitrary. We are continuing to protect fish stocks that have been completely rebuilt, and it is based on knee jerk, not sound science today. It is desperately in need of reform.

The economic impact in my State alone is \$1.3 billion from the recreational side and over \$2 billion from the commercial side. It is 30,000 jobs. There is nobody who lives along the coast who wants to go back to the Wild West days when anyone can catch whatever they want and destroy the fish stocks. Nobody wants that, but the current system is not working, and it needs to be reformed. This is a good bill that offers real solutions.

It preserves fish stocks; yet it recognizes the needs of our fishermen, and it relies on fact-based science. An amendment that I proposed and I am particularly pleased with is that it encourages marine students to be involved in the data collection, and it requires the government to look to them for that. We can do it at a lower cost and with better results.

I encourage my colleagues not to let the perfect become the enemy of the good. It is a good bill, and it deserves to be approved. I urge my colleagues to stand behind it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the panhandle of north Florida, red snapper is a way of life. Thousands of commercial fishermen and charter boat captains depend on a healthy catch to make a living.

Tens of thousands of recreational fishermen spend their free time and are personally invested in fishing, and hundreds of restaurants serve red snapper to hundreds of thousands of visitors to the area every year. Seafood is a \$7 billion industry the Gulf, and red snapper is a big part of it.

Like any valuable asset, we need to preserve our fisheries for future generations. I applaud the chairman and the ranking member for opening this dialogue about how we can improve current law, protect our ocean re-

sources, and best serve our constituents. Unfortunately, I think this bill falls short in its current form.

My constituents tell me there are more red snapper in the Gulf than there have been in a long time. I think that shows, at least in part, that this law is working, but I also hear of widespread distrust of the system and of the data that the system produces. In that regard, Magnuson isn't working nearly as well as it could, and I want to recognize some of the healthy reforms in this bill that could improve the situation.

It is an extraordinary challenge to count all of the fish in the sea—it is nearly as hard to count how many fish are being caught—but I think we could do both better by getting the States and stakeholders more involved and by promoting modern electronic monitoring technologies as this bill does.

Despite those good provisions, Florida would not be Florida without ample opportunities for recreational fishing and a robust commercial fishing sector. While current law isn't perfect, I think the contentious nature of this floor debate is a good indication that this bill isn't going to do anything to narrow the divisions between sectors.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. GRAHAM. The better alternative is to keep doing what is working and to improve data collection techniques where they are lacking.

To that end, I am proud to support an increase of \$10 million, included in the CJS appropriations bill, aimed at improving the stock assessments and research needs for Gulf of Mexico fish stocks. These are the kinds of efforts that build real confidence in the fishery. I look forward to a meaningful conversation about how we can work together going forward.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy you gave to the gentlewoman from Florida in allowing her to finish her statement. She illustrates very clearly how the problems that exist are structural problems that can't simply be solved if we just add more money to the situation.

To further that issue, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her comments.

In Texas, we have a great snapper fishing industry as well—anglers, recreational. We have charter boat captains. We have a lot of commercial industry as well. By the way, my daughter and first three grandchildren live in Florida, so Florida is my second home.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to talk about H.R. 1335 and a proposed amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana, my great friend, GARRET GRAVES, to change the snapper fishing system.

The problem is that the plan that has been developed in his amendment is ac-

tually a plan that was developed by five people in secrecy who want to change the way NOAA does things and turn it over to the five States. That is a bad idea, and I will tell you why for just a whole bunch of reasons.

The current plan has been working since 2007, which actually doubled the population of snapper. Indeed, it has provided a 30 percent increase in the quota this very season. Businesses have been working all along the Texas coast and—to my gentlewoman friend from Florida—the Florida coast and the whole Gulf Coast area to develop lasting fisheries because their livelihoods depend on it.

Mr. Chairman, I am an air conditioning contractor. We have an air conditioning commission there in Texas that regulates us. We want people on that commission who understand the HVAC industry. We do everything in the industry to promote the industry, to make sure that we have a good, stable industry that takes care of customers in Texas.

I have to know and believe that it is the same way about the fishing industry. They want the fisheries to last. Restaurants depend on it. Americans depend on it. It is not just the anglers but those who want to go eat at some of the restaurants the gentlewoman from Florida referenced. There are a lot of groups opposed to Mr. GRAVES' amendment—the National Restaurant Association, the Texas Restaurant Association. Mr. Chairman, I have a list of 42 others.

Gulf red snapper is an American treasure, and it should be accessible to all, not just to those who can get a boat and a trailer and go fish for themselves. They ought to be available to all of the restaurants. We have heard the facts and figures about the number of jobs and the amount of revenue that have been brought in and how big that industry is.

My good friend from Louisiana, Dr. JOHN FLEMING, who is a member of the committee, has publicly stated that some tweaking is needed, but by all three groups of stakeholders: charter boat fishing, the commercial fishing industry, and the individual anglers. I heard with my own ears the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee state his willingness to work with all three groups in the coming days.

Mr. Chairman, government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. To allow the group of five States to implement a plan—an unknown plan, I might add—would only put pressure on those individual States to outsupply the other States with a longer fishing season to attract anglers, tourists, and their money to outcompete the other States.

Fisheries would be devastated, and the livelihoods, jobs, and markets that are supplying red snapper to restaurants all across the country would be gone. Ultimately, it is the American consumers, who have come to like the

local seafood, who would be disenfranchised, not to mention the businesses that supply them.

Let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater or, dare I say, the fish with the saltwater. Let's bring all parties together in a thoughtful, deliberate, meaningful discussion that benefits all involved, not just a few.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the gentleman from Louisiana's amendment, well intentioned though it may be.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my esteemed colleague from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, if gutting the successful conservation provisions of Magnuson were not enough, the problem also is that this bill will also weaken other bedrock environmental laws.

First, it makes Magnuson then in this reauthorization the controlling statute in the case of any kind of conflict with the Antiquities Act or the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

If we think about this, there is no rationale for giving the councils that are authorized in Magnuson the authority to regulate fishing in marine sanctuaries or in monuments. Those areas represent just a tiny fraction of U.S. waters, and now, they are managed by scientists and other staff who consider more than just fishing interests.

We are really here to understand how do we balance fishing with the other purposes in order to protect vulnerable species and habitats. For the same reason that we don't allow State fish and game departments to make decisions about hunting in national parks or monuments on land, which we don't allow, these councils should not make decisions about fishing in our parks, our national marine sanctuaries, or in our national monuments at sea, but that is not enough.

The bill also takes a swipe at the Endangered Species Act by requiring these councils, not Federal agencies which are now responsible for the recovery of species, to implement the fishery restrictions necessary for Endangered Species compliance. These councils lack expertise, and they lack the resources to implement the Endangered Species Act.

What are we going to end up with? We are going to end up with recoveries that are going to be delayed, and the negative impacts to fishing communities are going to be prolonged, just the very thing that we wish not to happen.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. As I said before, these assaults on key conservation

laws are far outside the scope of a fisheries bill. We are really talking about a fisheries bill. We should not be talking about gutting key conservation laws.

It is unfortunate that an historically bipartisan effort like the Magnuson reauthorization has now become the subject of an antienvironmental crusade.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT), who will address an issue that will be part of this bill and the discussion as it comes up.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the chairman, and I would also like to thank DON YOUNG for helping those of us recreational anglers as we try to remedy an injustice that has been done to the American sportsmen of the Gulf of Mexico.

I have listened to some of my colleagues say we should be fair and people should come to the table. Let me tell you what is happening at the table.

Mr. Chairman, the commercial fishermen get to fish 365 days a year for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. They get to use long lines and winches; yet the National Marine Fisheries Services and Dr. Roy Crabtree, through the Gulf Council, have chosen to limit to 10 days the man and the woman who just want to take their kid fishing, 10 days.

They think, by expanding the recreational season back to where it was before, that somehow that would hurt the fish in the Gulf of Mexico.

□ 1630

Now they tell us that the reason they have had to cut us to 10 days is because there are so many more fish today and they are so much larger today that the recreational fishermen simply catch them much faster.

Well, in 2007, the recreational angler had 194 days to fish with their families in the Gulf of Mexico—194 days. In 8 years, they have taken the American family, the American sportsman, down to simply 10 days. It is proof that the American sportsman doesn't have a chance with the Federal Government in charge of the rulemaking process in the Gulf of Mexico with regard to the recreational snapper season.

The Garrett amendment, which I support, as I support the chairman's main piece of legislation, would simply give the States the right to set, based on science—not some arbitrary number, but based on science—the recreational seasons and bag limits for the recreational angler in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, that is the only way—that is the only way—that the recreational season will be restored as we, the recreational anglers, were promised it would be restored when the stocks came back.

Now, one of the things I think we also need to discuss as we go forward with regard to snapper is who do the snapper belong to.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there are about 300 people that are currently allocated about 50 percent of the fish, the red snapper, in the Gulf of Mexico. When the commercial quota goes up, they automatically get an increase. Those fish belong to the public, and I think it is time to discuss whether or not any increase in the commercial quota should actually come and be auctioned as any other public resource would be when we made those additional resources available.

For now, the Garrett amendment goes a long way towards restoring the rights of the American angler, and I certainly hope that this House will support it.

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

In closing, Congress first enacted the Fishery Conservation and Management Act in 1976, and the primary goals were two: to end the unregulated fishing by foreign fleets in U.S. waters, and to develop our domestic fleets that could reap the economic benefits of all the fishery resources, considerable resources that our Nation had.

The law worked. Foreign fishing was phased out and investments in domestic fleets were increased. Unfortunately, this capitalization worked so well that domestic fishing soon replaced foreign fleets in overexploiting U.S. fisheries.

In 1996 to 2007, the reauthorizations were enacted to end overfishing, period, promote rebuilding of overfished stocks, protect fish habitats, improve fisheries and habitats, and minimize bycatch. These changes ended overfishing in nearly all fisheries and put overfished stocks on a path to rebuilding. Most important, they insulated fishery management councils from pressure to make politically driven decisions that hurt fishing communities in the long run.

Contrary to those previous reauthorizations, H.R. 1335 was developed with very little input from Democrats and was ordered reported on a party line. I should note, at the last reauthorization, the other body made significant changes to the House-passed legislation and created a more bipartisan template that many of us could support.

The supporters of this bill will argue that the requirement to rebuild overfished stocks needs more flexibility, but the Magnuson Act has already proven to be plenty flexible. 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 have rebuilding plans longer than a 10-year baseline in the act.

Further, current law gives councils 2 years to put a rebuilding plan in place and an additional year to reduce, rather than end, overfishing. That is 3 years of lead time before significant harvest restrictions go into effect.

What is more, the act only requires a rebuilding plan to have a 50 percent likelihood of success. If a council loses this coin flip, it does not have to shut down the fishery; instead, it has to start over. This is exactly how things have played out over the past few years with Atlantic cod in New England, where many argue the act has been too flexible.

History shows us that when councils have an excuse to delay rebuilding overfished stocks, the job will never get done. This bill makes up the following excuses that allow councils to avoid rebuilding:

It is too hard to work with other countries that may be impacting the stock of the fish, so we should just catch more, too, and deplete the stock faster;

The stock of the fish cannot be rebuilt by only limited fishing, so there is no point in trying to limit fishing if the effort is 99 percent of the problem;

It is inconvenient to rebuild the overfished stocks that swim with healthy stocks, so we should just keep catching the weak ones until they are listed under the Endangered Species Act;

And my personal favorite, there are unusual events that make rebuilding more difficult.

These excuses are each bad enough alone, but together they would render the rebuilding requirements of Magnuson completely meaningless. This bill would not give the Magnuson Act more flexibility; it would break it. With that, I urge a “no” vote on the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There are some agencies of government that, if a bird were to fly over the Capitol, they would claim credit for it. That, perhaps, is one of the situations in which we find ourselves today. The problem is the status quo is not effective; it is not working.

Those who work and live in this area deal with this industry. They recognize that there is something that needs to be changed. That is why, as I stated earlier, the Garden State Seafood Association said there are problematic regulations that have not proven to function as intended—that is, in the status quo—while the National Fisheries Institute, another group that actually supports this bill, wants to do so because it would more effectively coordinate with the councils who are currently there.

We have a situation right now in which Southerners have spoken here—the gentleman from Texas, the gentlewoman from Florida—about problems that exist within the status quo. We are presenting, now, a bill that is supported by those who are working in the industry, supported by those who are commercial fishermen, and it is also supported by all the groups that represent the recreational fishers. They realize that this bill needs more flexibility.

To have a standard 10-year plan for every species when some of those species don't last 10 years is silly; it lacks common sense. We need to do that. There needs to be transparency, as some decisions are made behind closed doors. This bill mandates that that would not be the case. It needs to make sure that scientific data from all sources is used and recognized. That is not happening in the status quo. There needs to be the ability of cutting red tape.

Some people have talked about the change of NEPA without recognizing first that the law already mandates a similar process to NEPA, which has the exact same information. Requiring all these agencies to go through their process and then go through NEPA does not add to effectiveness or efficiency but does add to the opportunity of greater litigation costs.

All those issues are addressed in this particular bill. It needs to be reauthorized. We need to move forward. This is one of the bills that has taken a long time. It is 4 years in the process, with lots of discussion, lots of amendments. We are now moving this bill forward so it can go to the Senate. They can work their will. We can come back to a conference if necessary, but we must move forward in this for the benefit of the communities that use this area as their livelihood as well as this area as their recreation. The present system has flaws that need to be fixed.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1335, the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. This short-sighted legislation undermines the longterm sustainability of fish populations putting fish stocks, coastal communities, and our nation's economy at risk.

In California, we are fortunate to have access to one of the world's most productive marine ecosystems. The California Current system drives highly productive fisheries that support 158,000 jobs and more than \$25 billion annually in commercial and recreational sales impacts. Nationwide, fisheries generated \$199 billion in sales impacts in 2012 and provided 1.7 million jobs. Commercial and recreational fisheries are a critical part of this nation's economy whose continued prosperity depends on getting fisheries management right.

In 2015, California entered its fourth year of extreme drought. This winter's snowpack levels were the lowest since 1950 and precipitation levels are at critical lows. That spells bad news for California salmon. High water temperatures lead to poor survival and low flows leave salmon stranded in drying pools. Unfortunately, this is not the first time we have faced this problem. In 2008, low flows and high in-stream temperatures coupled with low ocean productivity caused a crash in salmon populations, and for the first time since 1848, the California salmon fishery was closed and declared a federal fishery disaster. The Pacific Fishery Management Council had already prepared a fishery management plan for salmon, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens

Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) guidelines, that prompted the fishery closure and set strict limits on harvest while the stock was rebuilding. Since the closure, salmon fisheries have rebounded, due in no small part to the swift action of the Council under the fishery management plan and rebuilding guidelines established by the MSA.

While we cannot make it rain in California, we can ensure that well-informed management of offshore salmon fisheries do not jeopardize the sustainability of this commercially-valuable species. The more fish we conserve in the ocean, the more return to streams to spawn, increasing our chances of making it through this drought with a salmon fishery intact.

The fact is, MSA is working. The implementation of stock rebuilding plans and annual catch limits have resulted in the recovery of 37 fish stocks since 2000. NOAA's 2014 Status of Stocks report indicates that fish stocks that are overfished or subject to overfishing are at an all-time low. This is a far cry from the over-exploited, overcapitalized fisheries of the past. We should be moving forward to build on those successes, not rolling them back. Since 2006, commercial fisheries revenue has risen 43 percent, and the rebuilding of all U.S. fish stocks would provide an additional \$31 billion in annual sales impacts and support 500,000 new jobs. Instead, H.R. 1335 would delay rebuilding timelines and allow exemptions to continue overfishing on depleted stocks, which is both ecologically and economically irresponsible. Current MSA provisions have proven their effectiveness in rebuilding stocks and provide the way forward for realizing our fisheries' full economic potential. There's something to be said for the old adage, “If it's not broken, don't fix it.”

That's not to say that fisheries management should remain stagnant. Just as scientific data collection and fisheries science is changing and improving, our fisheries management statute should also change to reflect the best available science. Fisheries managers and scientists have acknowledged that there are areas for improvement, including providing more clarity and flexibility within the current statutory limits. To that end, NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service is currently undertaking a revision of the National Standard 1 guidelines, the regulations that govern fisheries management objectives and stock rebuilding timelines, to provide greater clarity on which fish stocks require rebuilding plans, greater flexibility for rebuilding timelines, and to incorporate the latest in ecosystem-based fisheries management. The proposed revisions would address many of the concerns outlined in this bill without undermining the critical conservation measures that have led to MSA's success. The determination on how to best manage fish stocks for a sustainable, profitable future is best left to the scientists, not Members of Congress.

Our oceans are increasingly under threat from climate change and ocean acidification, making strong, effective fisheries management more critical than ever. Unfortunately, H.R. 1335 does not deliver and I urge a NO vote on H.R. 1335.

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.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-16. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1335

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. 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. 3. 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.).

SEC. 4. 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 insert-

ing “; 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 determination 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. 5. MODIFICATIONS TO THE ANNUAL CATCH LIMIT REQUIREMENT.

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) **CONSIDERATION OF ECOSYSTEM AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS.**—In establishing annual catch limits a Council may, consistent with section 302(h)(6), consider changes in an ecosystem and the economic needs of the fishing communities.

“(2) **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.

“(3) **RELATIONSHIP TO INTERNATIONAL FISHERY EFFORTS.**—Each annual catch limit may, consistent with section 302(h)(6), take into account—

“(A) management measures under international agreements in which the United States participates;

“(B) informal transboundary agreements under which fishery management activities by another country 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

“(C) in instances in which no transboundary agreement exists, activities by another country outside the exclusive economic zone that 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.

“(4) **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

“(B) annual catch limits for each year in any continuous period that is not more than three years in duration.

“(5) **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.”.

SEC. 6. DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN OVERFISHED AND DEPLETED.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (34), by striking “The terms ‘overfishing’ and ‘overfished’ mean” and inserting “The term ‘overfishing’ means”; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(8a) 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.”.

(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. 1854(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.”.

(d) **CLARITY IN ANNUAL REPORT.**—Section 304(e)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1854(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. 7. 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 (l), 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 302(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 304(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 decisionmaking 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.

“(7) Actions taken in accordance with this section are deemed to fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and all related implementing regulations.”

(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. 8. 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. 9. REPORT ON FEE.

Section 304(d)(2) (16 U.S.C. 1854(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) The Secretary shall report annually on the amount collected under this paragraph from each fishery and detail how the funds were spent in the prior year on a fishery-by-fishery basis, to—

“(i) Congress; and

“(ii) each Council from whose fisheries the fee under this paragraph were collected.”

SEC. 10. DATA COLLECTION AND DATA CONFIDENTIALITY.

(a) ELECTRONIC MONITORING.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall issue regulations governing the use of electronic monitoring for the purposes of monitoring fisheries that are subject to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(B) CONTENT.—The regulations shall—

(i) distinguish between monitoring for data collection and research purposes and monitoring for compliance and enforcement purposes; and

(ii) include minimum criteria, objectives, or performance standards for electronic monitoring.

(C) PROCESS.—In issuing the regulations the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with the Councils and fishery management commissions;

(ii) publish the proposed regulations; and

(iii) provide an opportunity for the submission by the public of comments on the proposed regulations.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), and after the issuance of the final regulations, a Council, or the Secretary for fisheries referred to in section 302(a)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(3)), may, in accordance with the regulations, on a fishery-by-fishery basis and consistent with the existing objectives and management goals of a fishery management plan and the Act for a fishery issued by the Council or the Secretary, respectively, amend such plan—

(i) to incorporate electronic monitoring as an alternative tool for data collection and monitoring purposes or for compliance and enforcement purposes (or both); and

(ii) to allow for the replacement of a percentage of on-board observers with electronic monitoring.

(B) **COMPARABILITY.**—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to a fishery only if the Council or Secretary, respectively, determines that such monitoring will yield comparable data collection and compliance results.

(3) **PILOT PROJECTS.**—Before the issuance of final regulations, a Council, or the Secretary for fisheries referred to in section 302(a)(3), may, subject to the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, on a fishery-by-fishery basis, and consistent with the existing objectives and management goals of a fishery management plan for a fishery issued by the Council or the Secretary, respectively, conduct a pilot project for the use of electronic monitoring for the fishery.

(4) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall issue final regulations under this subsection by not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **VIDEO AND ACOUSTIC SURVEY TECHNOLOGIES.**—The Secretary shall work with the Regional Fishery Management Councils and nongovernmental entities to develop and implement the use pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) of video survey technologies and expanded use of acoustic survey technologies.

(c) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 402(b) (16 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) to State or Marine Fisheries Commission employees as necessary for achievement of the purposes of this Act, subject to a confidentiality agreement between the State or Commission, respectively, and the Secretary that prohibits public disclosure of the identity of any person and of confidential information.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “limited access” and inserting “catch share”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (G), by striking “limited access” and inserting “catch share”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “, and information obtained through a vessel monitoring system or other technology used onboard a fishing vessel for enforcement or data collection purposes,” after “information”;

(ii) by striking “or” after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) as authorized by any regulations issued under paragraph (6) allowing the collection of observer information, pursuant to a confidentiality agreement between the observers, observer employers, and the Secretary prohibiting disclosure of the information by the observers or observer employers, in order—

“(i) to allow the sharing of observer information among observers and between observers and observer employers as necessary to train and prepare observers for deployments on specific vessels; or

“(ii) to validate the accuracy of the observer information collected; or

“(D) to other persons if the Secretary has obtained written authorization from the person who submitted such information or from the person on whose vessel the information was collected, to release such information for reasons not otherwise provided for in this subsection.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (6); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) Any information submitted to the Secretary, a State fisheries management agency, or a Marine Fisheries Commission by any person in compliance with the requirements of this Act, including confidential information, may only be used for purposes of fisheries management and monitoring and enforcement under this Act.

“(4) The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the heads of other Federal agencies for the sharing of confidential information to ensure safety of life at sea or for fisheries enforcement purposes, including information obtained through a vessel monitoring system or other electronic enforcement and monitoring systems, if—

“(A) the Secretary determines there is a compelling need to do so; and

“(B) the heads of the other Federal agencies agree—

“(i) to maintain the confidentiality of the information in accordance with the requirements that apply to the Secretary under this section; and

“(ii) to use the information only for the purposes for which it was shared with the agencies.

“(5) The Secretary may not provide any vessel-specific or aggregate vessel information from a fishery that is collected for monitoring and enforcement purposes to any person for the purposes of coastal and marine spatial planning under Executive Order 13547, unless the Secretary determines that providing such information is important for maintaining or enhancing national security or for ensuring fishermen continued access to fishing grounds.”.

(2) **CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION DEFINED.**—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(4a) The term ‘confidential information’ means—

“(A) trade secrets;

“(B) proprietary information;

“(C) observer information; and

“(D) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which is likely to result in harm to the competitive position of the person that submitted the information to the Secretary.”.

(d) **INCREASED DATA COLLECTION AND ACTIONS TO ADDRESS DATA-POOR FISHERIES.**—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **USE OF THE ASSET FORFEITURE FUND FOR FISHERY INDEPENDENT DATA COLLECTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) The Secretary, subject to appropriations, may obligate for data collection purposes in accordance with prioritizations under paragraph (3) a portion of amounts received by the United States as fisheries enforcement penalties.

“(B) Amounts may be obligated under this paragraph only in the fishery management region with respect to which they are collected.

“(2) **INCLUDED PURPOSES.**—The purposes referred to in paragraph (1) include—

“(A) the use of State personnel and resources, including fishery survey vessels owned and maintained by States to survey or assess data-poor fisheries for which fishery management plans are in effect under this Act; and

“(B) cooperative research activities authorized under section 318 to improve or enhance the fishery independent data used in fishery stock assessments.

“(3) **DATA-POOR FISHERIES PRIORITY LISTS.**—Each Council shall—

“(A) identify those fisheries in its region considered to be data-poor fisheries;

“(B) prioritize those fisheries based on the need of each fishery for up-to-date information; and

“(C) provide those priorities to the Secretary.

“(4) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) The term ‘data-poor fishery’ means a fishery—

“(i) that has not been surveyed in the preceding 5-year period;

“(ii) for which a fishery stock assessment has not been performed within the preceding 5-year period; or

“(iii) for which limited information on the status of the fishery is available for management purposes.

“(B) The term ‘fisheries enforcement penalties’ means any fine or penalty imposed, or proceeds of any property seized, for a violation of this Act or of any other marine resource law enforced by the Secretary.

“(5) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for each fiscal year to carry out this subsection up to 80 percent of the fisheries enforcement penalties collected during the preceding fiscal year.”.

SEC. 11. 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 include 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 all after “including” and inserting an em dash, followed on the next line by the following:

“(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. 12. 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”;

(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”.

SEC. 13. GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) **REPEAL.**—Section 407 (16 U.S.C. 1883), and the item relating to such section in the table of contents in the first section, are repealed.

(b) **REPORTING AND DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) in conjunction with the States, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and the recreational fishing sectors, develop and implement a real-time reporting and data collection program for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery using available technology; and

(2) make implementation of this subsection a priority for funds received by the Secretary and allocated to this region under section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (commonly known as the “Saltonstall-Kennedy Act”) (15 U.S.C. 713c-3).

(c) **FISHERIES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Commerce—

(1) shall, in conjunction with the States, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, and the commercial, charter, and recreational fishing sectors, develop and implement a cooperative research program authorized under section 318 for the fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic regions, giving priority to those fisheries that are considered data-poor; and

(2) may, subject to the availability of appropriations, use funds received by the Secretary under section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (commonly known as the “Saltonstall-Kennedy Act”) (15 U.S.C. 713c-3) to implement this subsection.

(d) **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.

(e) **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.

(f) **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.”.

(g) **FUNDING OF STOCK ASSESSMENTS.**—The Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, shall enter into a cooperative agreement for the funding of stock assessments that are necessitated by any action by the Bureau with respect to offshore oil rigs in the Gulf of Mexico that adversely impacts red snapper.

SEC. 14. 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. 15. ENSURING CONSISTENT MANAGEMENT FOR FISHERIES THROUGHOUT THEIR RANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) 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 1906.**—In any case of a con-

flict between this Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or the Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), this Act shall control.

“(b) **FISHERIES RESTRICTIONS UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973.**—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.”.

SEC. 16. 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 Council.

“(B) **MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE.**—The percentage established by the North Pacific Council shall not exceed 24 percent of the pollock available to be harvested in the directed pollock fishery.”.

SEC. 17. RECREATIONAL FISHING DATA.

(a) **RECREATIONAL DATA COLLECTION.**—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 States.

“(C) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress and publish biennial reports that include—

“(i) the estimated accuracy of the registry program established under paragraph (1) and of State programs that are exempted under paragraph (2);

“(ii) priorities for improving recreational fishing data collection; and

“(iii) an explanation of any use of information collected by such State programs and by the Secretary, including a description of any consideration given to the information by the Secretary.

“(D) **STATES GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall make grants to States to improve implementation of State programs consistent with this subsection. The Secretary shall prioritize such grants based on the ability of the grant to improve the quality and accuracy of such programs.”.

(b) **STUDY ON RECREATIONAL FISHERIES DATA.**—Section 401(g) (16 U.S.C. 1881(g)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **STUDY ON PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council of the National

Academy of Sciences to study the implementation of the programs described in this section. The study shall—

“(i) provide an updated assessment of recreational survey methods established or improved since the publication of the Council’s report ‘Review of Recreational Fisheries Survey Methods (2006)’;

“(ii) evaluate the extent to which the recommendations made in that report were implemented pursuant to paragraph (3)(B); and

“(iii) examine any limitations of the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey and the Marine Recreational Information Program established under paragraph (1).

“(B) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after entering into an agreement under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study under subparagraph (A).”.

SEC. 18. STOCK ASSESSMENTS USED FOR FISHERIES MANAGED UNDER GULF OF MEXICO COUNCIL’S REEF FISH MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV (16 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 409. STOCK ASSESSMENTS USED FOR FISHERIES MANAGED UNDER GULF OF MEXICO COUNCIL’S REEF FISH MANAGEMENT PLAN.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission shall conduct all fishery stock assessments used for management purposes by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council for the fisheries managed under the Council’s Reef Fish Management Plan.

“(b) **USE OF OTHER INFORMATION AND ASSETS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Such fishery assessments shall—

“(A) incorporate fisheries survey information collected by university researchers; and

“(B) to the extent practicable, use State, university, and private assets to conduct fisheries surveys.

“(2) **SURVEYS AT ARTIFICIAL REEFS.**—Any such fishery stock assessment conducted after the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act shall incorporate fishery surveys conducted, and other relevant fisheries information collected, on and around natural and artificial reefs.

“(c) **CONSTITUENT AND STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION.**—Each such fishery assessment shall—

“(1) emphasize constituent and stakeholder participation in the development of the assessment;

“(2) contain all of the raw data used in the assessment and a description of the methods used to collect that data; and

“(3) employ an assessment process that is transparent and includes—

“(A) includes a rigorous and independent scientific review of the completed fishery stock assessment; and

“(B) a panel of independent experts to review the data and assessment and make recommendations on the most appropriate values of critical population and management quantities.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents in the first section is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title IV the following:

“Sec. 408. Deep sea coral research and technology program.

“Sec. 409. Stock assessments used for fisheries managed under Gulf of Mexico Council’s Reef Fish Management Plan.”.

SEC. 19. ESTIMATION OF COST OF RECOVERY FROM FISHERY RESOURCE DISASTER.

Section 312(a)(1) (16 U.S.C. 1861a(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(1)”;

(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. 20. 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. 21. 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.

SEC. 22. 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.

SEC. 23. SUBSISTENCE FISHING.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended 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 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) 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”.

SEC. 24. INTER-SECTOR TRADING OF COMMERCIAL CATCH SHARE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

Section 301 (16 U.S.C. 1851) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) INTER-SECTOR TRADING OF COMMERCIAL CATCH SHARE ALLOCATIONS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any commercial fishing catch share allocation in a fishery in the Gulf of Mexico may only be traded by sale or lease within the same commercial fishing sector.”.

SEC. 25. 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. 26. PREFERENCE FOR STUDENTS STUDYING WATER RESOURCE ISSUES.

Section 402(e) (16 U.S.C. 1881a(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The Secretary shall require that in the hiring of individuals to collect information regarding marine recreational fishing under this subsection, preference shall be given to individuals who are students studying water resource issues at an institution of higher education.”.

SEC. 27. 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 the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall enter into an arrangement with the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mixed-use fisheries—

(1) to provide guidance to Regional Fishery Management Councils established under section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852) 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 under that Act;

(2) to identify sources of information that could reasonably support the use of such criteria in allocation decisions; and

(3) to develop procedures for allocation reviews and potential adjustments in allocations based on the guidelines and requirements established by this section.

(b) PROCESS FOR ALLOCATION REVIEW AND ESTABLISHMENT.—The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council shall—

(1) within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, review the allocations of all mixed-use fisheries in the Councils’ respective jurisdictions; and

(2) every 3 years thereafter, perform subsequent reviews of such allocations; and

(3) consider the conservation and socioeconomic benefits of each sector in any allocation decisions for such fisheries.

SEC. 28. 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 2015 through 2019”.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those

printed in House Report 114–128. 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–128.

Mrs. DINGELL. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 14, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 16, line 3 and insert closing quotation marks and a following period.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the National Environmental Policy Act, also called NEPA, is a critically important law, not only for protecting the environment, but also for protecting the people’s right to participate in government decisionmaking. Sadly, H.R. 1335, the bill we are considering today, would short-circuit public review and comment on fisheries management decisions, casting NEPA aside in favor of an inadequate, poorly defined process that would make regional fishery management councils the ultimate arbiters of whether or not their own decisions would impact coastal communities and ocean ecosystems.

Forcing important NEPA analysis to be fast-tracked onto a council’s timeline would eliminate crucial oversight steps that provide stakeholders an opportunity to impact the public policy. While I know my colleagues had good intentions, the practical impact of this language means that local communities and businesses will not have the same opportunity to comment and have input on decisions that will impact their livelihood.

I don’t think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really want to limit public participation in this manner. My amendment simply strikes the harmful language from the bill that undermines NEPA because limiting transparency and accountability is not the right thing to do.

NEPA has a simple premise: look before you leap. For decades, NEPA has improved our environment and fostered fairness in our communities by ensuring that government remains accountable to the people. The NEPA process requires Federal agencies to review their proposed actions in light of their potential impacts on the human environment: the places where we all live, work, and play.

Most importantly, NEPA gives the public an opportunity to review and comment on actions proposed by the government, adding unique perspectives to the evaluation process that highly specialized, mission-driven agencies might otherwise ignore. In that way, NEPA is the ultimate check on Big Government, a uniquely American and quintessentially democratic—small D—law written and executed to help people protect their rights and freedoms. Our Founding Fathers would certainly be proud.

I hope that my colleagues will agree that existing NEPA protections should be preserved, and I ask that you vote in favor of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in response to the amendment, I simply have to say no, it does not assume the system.

We do have a problem with transparency in the process that we have. The underlying bill changes that by requiring these decisions to be made public and made openly, but the specific issue that dealing with NEPA misses a step, misses an important point here.

Current law requires fishery management plans contain a fishery impact statement. That is required by law now, required by the bill as well. That is in line with everything you go through to do an environmental impact statement under NEPA.

What this amendment would do is simply require the process to do everything twice. You do a fishery impact statement first, and then you restate and redo the same business with the same cost attached to it for the NEPA analysis. That is simply red tape.

□ 1645

It is an unnecessary delay. It makes some of the scientific information obsolete before they are done. It burdens the management and the resource council, which is why those, once again, who work in this system have said this is an unnecessary part and one of the reasons they like the efficiency that has been added by the basic, underlying bill.

The most important reason, though, why you don't want to accept this amendment is, if you add two different approaches, two different statements that have to be made, you give attorneys two different opportunities to liti-

gate. You give more opportunities to litigate, more opportunities to delay, and that is ridiculous. It lacks common sense because you are doing the same thing in both processes. Cut the red tape, cut the litigation opportunity, cut the delays, and help us move forward.

I reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. DINGELL. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Dingell amendment.

As many of us in Congress know, our Nation's fisheries do not work on artificial timelines. If we want to be sure that fishery plans are getting the critical National Environmental Policy Act analysis that conserve and preserve our resources, we can't force these NEPA studies to be fast-tracked.

The underlying bill would force important environmental analyses to be rushed and, therefore, cut stakeholders out of the process due to rapid timelines.

At a time when we are trying to make sure that we keep stakeholders engaged in the process, they would actually get less consideration under the bill that we have on the floor today.

We need to ensure that our communities are given a chance to weigh in on these plans, and in that process that we take a thorough look at the environmental impacts of these plans.

My colleague has said that her amendment would restore common sense and requires us to look before we leap. I couldn't agree more.

I urge my colleagues to oppose artificial timelines for environmental reviews, and I urge my colleagues to support the Dingell amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to quickly respond to some of the comments made by the other side.

Federal agency responsibility for NEPA is effectively being eliminated by this law and an alternative, undefined process is being established hindering the public's ability to influence policies and protect their rights.

Stakeholders, including businesses and individuals, would get less consideration in the council process and would not have a way of voicing their concerns and influencing the directions of plans or projects that could threaten the environment or the livelihoods of these people. It is simply common sense that plans to manage our valuable resources be properly assessed before resources are harvested.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I would just, again, like to remind my colleagues this was requested by the communities so there wouldn't be a delay. We are not eliminating NEPA. There is already a process in the Magnuson Act which was not there in the original act, I will say that, and I did support it when it went in. But to duplicate it and to require outside interests that they cannot respect those in the community—which is really what her amendment would do. It lets other outside interest groups get involved in this issue of sustainable fisheries.

This has always been a fishery community bill, not an outside bill or interest groups getting into the issues of sustainability and community activity through transparency. What you do is you start a duplication of the process. It is not necessary. We are not eliminating NEPA. We are just adding to it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me close by simply saying this. The environmentally friendly approach would be not to accept this amendment because think of all the trees you are going to save from reprinting an extra report that says the same thing over again.

We are already doing this process in the law. Requiring NEPA plus the fishery statement is simply a replication of the process that is already there. It does not need to be there. You are not cutting anyone out, as has been said. It is simply one of those things that you need to do it the first time and do it right the first time, and you don't have to redo it a second time to allow lawyers to then come up with another chance to litigate one more time.

I reject the amendment. I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-128.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 7, strike "and".

Page 28, line 11, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 28, after line 11, insert the following: "(C) fishery research and independent stock assessments, conservation gear engineering, at-sea and shoreside monitoring, fishery impact statements, and other priorities established by the Council as necessary

to rebuild or maintain sustainable fisheries, ensure healthy ecosystems, and maintain fishing communities.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, 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 builds off of years of efforts to reform the use of the asset forfeiture fund. During this time, NOAA has conducted internal reviews and audits for the use of asset forfeiture monies. Yet I believe it is important that we authorize specific uses to help our struggling fishermen and, at the same time, promote sustainable fishing.

My amendment would ensure that forfeiture funds are used for five things: first, enhancing fishery research and stock assessments. This bill authorizes the use of State personnel and resources, things like cooperative research between industry and public science and use of vessels to serve a data-poor fisheries. My amendment expands beyond data-poor fisheries by authorizing broader use of forfeiture funds for research and independent stock assessments.

This is particularly important in the Northeast, where timely information may be the difference between the success or failure of a small fishing business.

Secondly, it deals with at-sea and shoreside monitoring. If there is one concern that I have heard consistently voiced from fishermen from New Bedford to the South Shore to Provincetown in Massachusetts, it is the transition of funding for monitoring from NOAA to fishermen.

It has been nearly 3 years since the Department of Commerce declared a fishing disaster in the Northeast. As the fishing industry continues to face the long-term challenges coming back from this disaster, this is no time to switch the burden of the cost of monitoring onto them.

Third, it advances conservation gear engineering. Additional funds will help fishermen develop and adopt new gear and technology to improve efficiency, reduce the impact on the marine environment, and promote sustainable fishing for future generations.

Commercial and recreational fishermen use an array of gear to target their catch. An unfortunate and fatal consequence is the inclusion of untargeted fish, turtles, and marine mammals as bycatch. Fortunately, there have been efforts underway nationwide to promote sustainable means of fishing, like scallopers in New Bedford developing the turtle dredge to protect sea turtles from interaction during scalloping, and the New England Aquarium collaborative that has developed acoustic pingers that successfully warn marine mammals away from gill nets.

Fourth, the amendment will help with additional research for fishery im-

pact statements. Under the bill, councils are required to develop fishery impact statements that take into account the purpose of a proposed management plan and its potential impact on fisheries and fishing communities. In doing so, the bill shifts the responsibility from NEPA to the councils. And while I have concerns about how this will be implemented, I do believe it is critical that we provide councils with adequate resources.

Finally, the bill and the amendment will help funding priorities of the regional fishery management councils, like efforts to rebuild or maintain sustainable fisheries and ensure healthy ecosystems.

There is no doubt that additional funding for these efforts is a win for fishermen on all coasts of our country.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for the time, and for all the work that he has done, along with Mr. LYNCH, on behalf of our Commonwealth's fishing communities.

I rise in strong support of this amendment, which clarifies the uses of NOAA's asset forfeiture fund so we can make smart investments in scientific research and preserve an economically viable fishing industry.

This amendment will provide our fishermen, shoreside businesses, and fishing communities with the assurance that the money in NOAA's asset forfeiture fund will go towards improving the science behind sustainable fishery management practices.

Additionally, the amendment offers fisheries councils the resources they need to better serve our fisheries and fishing communities.

At the end of the day, both the fishermen and the environmentalists want the same thing: healthy and sustainable fisheries. I believe that the amendment will help achieve this objective through meaningful and targeted uses of NOAA's asset forfeiture fund. I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In 2010, the Department of Commerce inspector general reported that NOAA was misusing these funds for all sorts of purposes not actually helping the fishing community. That is one of the reasons why we are clearly saying the status quo has problems, and this bill needs to go forward.

This bill recognized that these funds should not be used to add to the bu-

reaucracy, and therefore in the base bill we actually put in provisions to allow up to 80 percent of these enforcement funds to be used for collection and data and science.

What Mr. KEATING and others have done, though, is take the process one step further in something I think is a very commonsense solution to a problem that we do have in the status quo. I appreciate what you are doing, and I support this amendment.

I urge everyone to vote “yes,” and I yield back balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Keating-Lynch-Moulton amendment to allow monies from the asset forfeiture fund to be available for expanded uses. I want to commend my colleagues from Massachusetts for their continued efforts on behalf of our fishing industry.

Massachusetts has a long and proud fishing history. In fact, the “sacred cod”, a nearly five foot long woodcarving of an atlantic codfish, has hung in the Massachusetts House of Representatives since 1794, representing the importance of the cod fishery to the commonwealth.

We all know the state of the fishing industry today. Depleted stocks and the policies put in place to rebuild those stocks have exacted a heavy toll. And we have all heard the stories of fishing families struggling to make ends meet and keep their generations-long family businesses alive. Our amendment is a common sense amendment which, if adopted, will build on and improve the systems put in place to assess and rebuild stocks while also providing some financial relief to the men and women who continue to earn a living at sea.

Our amendment, if adopted, will provide the funding necessary for fisheries councils to undertake certain reporting requirements of the underlying bill. Our amendment will also provide funding for independent research and stock assessments and for the development and implementation of gear that will reduce the impact on the marine environment and promote sustainable fishing for future generations. And, importantly, this amendment will also provide a funding stream to pay for at-sea and shore-side monitoring, a financial burden that fishermen simply cannot bear.

We simply cannot allow the money in the NOAA's asset forfeiture fund to be wasted when fishermen stand to benefit from targeted scientific research and resources dedicated to the fishing industry.

The health of the resource is the basic building block upon which all industry dependents rely. And it is critical that all parties; fishermen, fisheries councils, researchers and conservationists work cooperatively and also strike an appropriate balance towards sustainability. Our amendment provides the financial support to help all stakeholders further invest in and maximize the outcomes of their piece of the larger puzzle.

I urge my colleagues to support the Keating-Lynch-Moulton Amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-128.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 13 (page 34, after line 22), add the following:

(h) PROCESS FOR DECOMMISSIONING OIL AND GAS PLATFORMS AND DRILLING RIGS.—The National Ocean Council, operating under Executive Order 13547, shall convene a meeting of representatives of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, the States represented on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and stakeholders, to develop a process for decommissioning oil and gas platforms and drilling rigs that eliminates harm to the Gulf of Mexico red snapper stock of fish and enhances conservation of habitat of such stock.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the bill before us, H.R. 1335, undermines nearly two decades of progress making U.S. fisheries profitable and sustainable.

A few weeks ago, NOAA reported that overfishing has hit an all-time low, and the number of rebuilt stocks has hit an all-time high, largely because of the success of the Magnuson-Stevens Act reforms of both 1996 and 2007—the same reforms that this bill today before us would undercut.

In an attempt to add some good policy to an otherwise unproductive bill, I am offering an amendment to improve the management of one important fish stock: the Gulf of Mexico red snapper.

Last year, during a series of Natural Resources Committee hearings on fisheries policies, we heard from members and witnesses who were irate over the fact that the Interior Department was allowing offshore oil platforms and drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico to be decommissioned in a way that was killing red snapper and destroying important snapper habitat. After intense questioning, it became clear that in the current process for decommissioning rigs, NOAA, which is part of the Department of Commerce, is not regularly consulted by Interior agencies.

□ 1700

As a result, NOAA does not even conduct surveys to determine if the Department of the Interior is about to dismantle a productive artificial reef teeming with red snapper and other fish.

Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleagues from the Gulf States who feel this is ridiculous and needs to stop; but how do we do it? Then I remembered that we already have a mechanism in place for resolving exactly this kind of multi-stakeholder conflict at sea. It is called the National Ocean Policy.

Through the National Ocean Policy, the National Ocean Council facilitates commonsense governance of public resources. Like air traffic control for the seas, the council coordinates all of the users of our oceans and helps them determine safer, less contentious, and more efficient utilization of ocean resources.

My amendment would direct the agencies responsible for implementing the National Ocean Policy to work with the Gulf States and other stakeholders to develop a transparent process that would preserve red snapper habitat during rig decommissioning.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for more recreational fishing opportunities in the Gulf of Mexico and a vote for a bipartisan solution to promoting red snapper habitat.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the Lowenthal amendment.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on this particular amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this same amendment was offered in committee; it failed. It is my understanding that rigs and platforms are already required to eliminate harm under their leases. In fact, most of the fishermen I talk to on the Gulf say the platforms are really manmade reefs, and the red snapper love them.

Overall, I don’t support giving the National Ocean Council any authorities. The council is created by executive action, and until the Congress passes legislation regarding the National Ocean Policy, Congress should not implement measures to support it.

This is not an action of Congress. This is an action by executive order. Remember, this bill originally was sustainable yield, sustainable communities, nothing to do with an ocean council deciding what is going to happen to override the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

This is a bad amendment, and I oppose the gentleman’s amendment.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. As you just heard from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chair, they agree with me that there needs to be more coordination amongst all the stakeholders to make smart decisions about rig decommissioning in red snapper habitat; but they refuse to move forward with this proposal simply because they oppose the National Ocean Policy which incidentally, as we all know in this room, that its predecessor was the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, which was first established by President Bush.

They oppose the National Ocean Policy on the grounds that it is a program that is authorized by an executive action or an executive order of a President that they don’t like. This seems to me to be pretty petty.

Why would we create now a new group to bring together the stakeholders to address just this one issue, when we already have a council and a policy that can do exactly what everyone wants to be done?

National Ocean Policy is not a failed policy like some suggest, nor is it an instance of executive overreach. It is merely a commonsense way to facilitate multistakeholder collaboration on complex ocean issues.

Mr. Chair, my amendment directs agencies and stakeholders to work together to come up with solutions to decommission rigs that work for everyone involved. This is a commonsense solution that promotes red snapper habitat and more recreational fishing opportunities.

I urge a “yes” vote on the Lowenthal amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for offering this amendment. We had the opportunity to discuss this in committee.

I am very sensitive to the fact that we do things in a manner that sustains all of our fisheries and protects our ecosystem.

However, as we discussed in committee, I did request of you, number one, that if you let us get together as Gulf States, continue to work together with the Department of the Interior—as I mentioned in committee, we have even larger concerns about the way that some of this important reef structure, such as rigs and reefs programs and others, have been handled by the Federal Government.

I respect the gentleman for offering this amendment, but I am going to vote in opposition, giving us time to work together with industry, work together with the fisherman, and find the right way to do this to ensure that we protect the species.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, allow me to conclude the debate, if I may.

Last year, in Congress, we had a hearing where we saw a huge number of red snappers who were killed by the removal of a decommissioned oil platform that had been authorized by the Department of the Interior. This amendment does not really change that.

What this amendment would do is an attempt—hopefully, futile attempt—to basically give validity to the administration’s National Ocean Policy, a policy that was done without transparency, almost in the cover of darkness, and implemented by executive order.

What we are talking about is not something that is an executive action, but, as properly said by the last two speakers from our side, it is a legislative action, and this bill takes that legislative responsibility and does it the right way.

We do not need a nontransparent executive order to be enforced here. What we need to do is allow the agencies of jurisdiction to actually do their job, defend their rules, and allow the legislative branch to work its will.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-128.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 46, strike lines 5 through 9 and insert the following:

"(4) The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, when hiring individuals to collect information regarding marine recreational fishing under this subsection, give preference to students studying fisheries conservation and management, water resource issues, or other relevant subjects at an institution of higher education in the United States."

Page 46, beginning at line 19, strike "Regional Fishery" and all that follows through line 22 and insert "the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council on criteria that"

Page 47, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REQUIREMENTS FOR LIMITED ACCESS PRIVILEGES.

Section 3303A(c)(1)(G) (16 U.S.C. 1853a(c)(1)(G)) is amended to read as follows:

"(G) include provisions for a formal and detailed review 5 years after the implementation of the program, and thereafter the regular monitoring and review by the Council and the Secretary of the operations and impacts of the program, to coincide with scheduled Council review of the relevant fishery management plan (but no less frequently than once every 7 years) including—

"(i) determining progress in meeting the goals of the program and this Act;

"(ii) delineating the positive and negative economic effects of the program on fishermen and processors who are part of the program and the coastal communities in which they reside; and

"(iii) any necessary modification of the program to meet those goals, including a formal schedule for action to be taken within 2 years;"

SEC. ____ . HEALTHY FISHERIES THROUGH BETTER SCIENCE.

(a) DEFINITION OF STOCK ASSESSMENT.—Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802), as amended by section 23(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 10(d) 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.

"(3) WAIVER OF STOCK ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A)(i) 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 paragraph (1) of section 404(f) 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.

(c) IMPROVING SCIENCE.—

(1) INCORPORATION OF INFORMATION FROM WIDE VARIETY OF SOURCES.—Section 2(a)(8) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801) is amended by adding at the end the following: "Fisheries management is most effective when it incorporates information provided by governmental and nongovernmental sources, including State and Federal agency staff, fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions. As appropriate, such information should be considered the best scientific information available and form the basis of conservation and management measures as required by this Act."

(2) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—Section 404 (16 U.S.C. 1881c), as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) IMPROVING DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Councils acting in reliance on their science and statistical committees established under section 302(g), shall develop and publish in the Federal Register guidelines that will facilitate greater incorporation of data, analysis, and stock assessments from nongovernmental sources, including fishermen, fishing communities, universities, and research institutions, into fisheries management decisions.

"(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines shall—

"(A) identify types of data and analysis, especially concerning recreational fishing, that can be reliably used 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 such data and analysis in stock assessments and for other purposes; and

"(B) provide specific guidance for collecting data and performing analyses identified as necessary to reduce the uncertainty referred to in section 404(f)(2)(C).

"(3) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DATA AND ANALYSES.—The Secretary and Regional Fishery Management Councils shall—

"(A) use all data and analyses that meet the guidelines published under paragraph (1) as the best scientific information available for purposes of this Act in fisheries management decisions, unless otherwise determined by the science and statistical committee of the Councils established pursuant to section 302(g) of the Act; and

"(B) explain in the Federal Register notice announcing the fishery management decision how such data and analyses have been used to establish conservation and management measures."

(3) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Commerce shall develop and publish guidelines under the amendment made by paragraph (2) by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) COST REDUCTION REPORT.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Regional Fishery Management Councils, shall submit a report to Congress that, with respect to each fishery governed by a fishery management plan in effect under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.)—

(1) identifies the goals of the applicable programs governing monitoring and enforcement of fishing that is subject to such plan;

(2) identifies methods to accomplish those goals, including human observers, electronic monitoring, and vessel monitoring systems;

(3) certifies which such methods are most cost-effective for fishing that is subject to such plan; and

(4) explains why such most-cost-effective methods are not required, if applicable.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, 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, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today makes a few clarifications to the underlying bill.

It modifies language in the bill allowing for the use of graduate students in the collection of recreational fishing data. The fields of science the graduate students are studying is expanded, and when the students can be used is clarified.

The amendment also clarifies that guidance prepared by the National Academy of Sciences regarding the economic benefits of commercial and recreational fishing within the mixed-use fisheries is to be given to the south Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico councils.

The amendment will also modify the provisions in law regarding the council review of limited access programs to include not only the benefits of the program, but also any adverse impacts.

Lastly, the amendment includes language to allow stock assessments to include information from universities, fishermen, fishing communities, and research institutions, in addition to State and Federal fisheries data.

It will also require a schedule for when stock assessments should occur and allows for a waiver if certain stocks don't need assessments.

These are good additions to the legislation, and I urge the Members to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The catch share reporting requirements and stock assessment mandates in this amendment would impose significant new costs on NOAA, but the amendment provides no additional funding.

The majority already complains that NOAA does not conduct stock assessments frequently or quickly enough. This unfunded mandate would further slow that process.

Further, these concepts have not been vetted by the Natural Resources Committee. We have not had an opportunity to get feedback on the legislation from NOAA, the agency that would inevitably be responsible for implementing it.

We need to hear from the administration about any potential costs or unin-

tended consequences of this amendment.

In particular, the rigid requirements of the guidelines envisioned in this bill would take away the discretion of expert scientists and undermine an ongoing effort NOAA is conducting to improve stock assessments across regions.

Further, the mandates, deadlines, and reports would likely cost money that is not authorized to be appropriated.

I would like to have additional input on the requirements this bill imposes with respect to developing and following new guidelines on data collection and on cost recovery by the agency.

For these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the gentleman from New Mexico's comments on this. This does not add an additional cost, and why people say that, I don't know.

All this does is very simple, and I explained it when I explained my amendment, and I urge the passage of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. My good friend, Mr. YOUNG, is perpetually trying to move me to New Mexico. I still love Arizona and will remain in Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the reasons of opposition have not changed to the amendment. The unintended consequences, the lack of full information as to what the data collection will be, any impending costs that would be secured that NOAA would have to undertake, and feedback both by the agency that would be responsible, feedback from the Natural Resources Committee, and feedback by the administration to this amendment would be, I think, important additions in order for this House to be able to make an informed decision on the amendment.

Lacking that information, I remain urging a "no" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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 114-128.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 29. TRANSFER TO STATES OF MANAGEMENT OF RED SNAPPER FISHERIES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE V—TRANSFER TO STATES OF MANAGEMENT OF RED SNAPPER FISHERIES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

"SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

"This title may be cited as the 'Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority Act'.

"SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

"In this title:

"(1) COASTAL WATERS.—The term 'coastal waters' means all waters of the Gulf of Mexico—

"(A) shoreward of the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured; and

"(B) seaward from the baseline described in subparagraph (A) to the outer boundary of the exclusive economic zone.

"(2) GULF COASTAL STATES.—The term 'Gulf coastal State' means each of the following States:

"(A) Alabama.

"(B) Florida.

"(C) Louisiana.

"(D) Mississippi.

"(E) Texas.

"(3) GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL.—The term 'Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council' means the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council established under section 302(a).

"(4) GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER.—The term 'Gulf of Mexico red snapper' means members of stocks or populations of the species *Lutjanus campechanus*, which ordinarily are found within the waters of the exclusive economic zone and adjacent territorial waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

"(5) GULF STATES RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—The term 'Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority' and 'GSR SMA', means the Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority established under section 503(a).

"(6) RED SNAPPER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term 'red snapper fishery management plan' means a plan created by one or more Gulf coastal States to manage Gulf of Mexico red snapper in the coastal waters adjacent to such State or States, respectively.

"(7) REEF FISH FEDERAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term 'Reef Fish Federal fishery management plan' means the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico, as amended, prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council pursuant to title III and implemented under part 622 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or similar successor regulation).

"(8) STATE TERRITORIAL WATERS.—The term 'State territorial waters', with respect to a Gulf coastal State, means the waters adjacent to such State seaward to the line three marine leagues seaward from the baseline from which of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.

"SEC. 503. MANAGEMENT OF GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER.

"(a) GULF STATES RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary shall establish a Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority that consists of the principal fisheries manager of each of the Gulf coastal States.

"(2) DUTIES.—The duties of the GSR SMA are as follows:

“(A) To review and approve red snapper fishery management plans, as set out in the Act.

“(B) To provide standards for each Gulf coastal State to use in developing fishery management measures to sustainably manage Gulf of Mexico red snapper in the coastal waters adjacent to such State.

“(C) To the maximum extent practicable, make scientific data, stock assessments and other scientific information upon which fishery management plans are based available to the public for inspection prior to meetings described in paragraph (c)(2).

“(b) REQUIREMENT FOR PLANS.—

“(1) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—The GRSRMA shall establish a deadline for each Gulf coastal State to submit to the GRSRMA a red snapper fishery management plan for such State.

“(2) CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS.—To the extent practicable, the Gulf Coastal States fishery management plans shall be consistent with the requirements in section 303(a) of the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1853(a)).

“(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this title and not more than 60 days after one or more Gulf coastal States submits a red snapper fishery management plan and annually thereafter, the GRSRMA shall review and approve by majority vote the red snapper fishery management plan if such plan meets the requirements of this title.

“(2) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Prior to approving a red snapper fishery management plan submitted by one or more Gulf coastal States, the GRSRMA shall provide an adequate opportunity for public participation, including—

“(A) at least 1 public hearing held in each respective Gulf coastal State; and

“(B) procedures for submitting written comments to GRSRMA on the fishery management plan.

“(3) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—A red snapper fishery management plan submitted by one or more Gulf coastal States shall—

“(A) contain standards and procedures for the long-term sustainability of Gulf of Mexico red snapper based on the best available science;

“(B) comply with the standards described in subsection (a)(2)(B); and

“(C) determine quotas for the red snapper fishery in the coastal waters adjacent to such Gulf coastal State or States, respectively, based on stock assessments, and—

“(i) any recommendation by the GRSRMA to reduce quota apportioned to the commercial sector by more than 10 percent shall be reviewed and approved by the Gulf Fishery Management Council;

“(ii) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this title and consistent with subsection (d), the GRSRMA shall not determine a quota apportioned to the commercial sector; and

“(iii) nothing in this Act shall be construed to change the individual quota shares currently in place in the commercial sector of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery

“(4) REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date the GRSRMA receives a red snapper fishery management plan from one or more Gulf coastal State or States, the GRSRMA shall review and approve such plan if such plan satisfies the requirements of subsection (b).

“(d) CONTINUED MANAGEMENT BY THE SECRETARY.—During the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary, in coordination with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, shall continue to manage the commercial

sector of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery.

“(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) REPORTS BY GULF COASTAL STATES.—Each Gulf coastal State shall submit to the GRSRMA an annual report on the status of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery in coastal waters adjacent to such State.

“(2) REPORT BY THE GRSRMA.—Not less often than once every 5 years, the GRSRMA shall use the information submitted in the annual reports required by paragraph (1) to prepare and submit to the Secretary a report on the status of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery.

“(3) ANNUAL REPORT BY NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress an annual report on the implementation of this title.

“SEC. 504. STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RED SNAPPER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS.

“(a) ALLOCATION OF MANAGEMENT TO THE GULF STATES.—

“(1) CERTIFICATION OF APPROVED PLANS.—The GRSRMA shall certify to the Secretary that a red snapper fishery management plan is approved under section 503 for each of the Gulf coastal States.

“(2) TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT.—Upon receipt of the certification described in paragraph (1) and subject to section 503 (d), the Secretary shall—

“(A) publish a notice in the Federal Register revoking the regulations and portions of the Reef Fish Federal fishery management plan that are in conflict with any red snapper fishery management plan approved by the GRSRMA; and

“(B) transfer management of Gulf of Mexico red snapper to the GRSRMA.

“(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the transfer of management described in subsection (a)(2)(B) and subject to section 503 (d), each Gulf coastal State shall implement and enforce the red snapper fishery management plans approved under section 503 for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery in the coastal waters adjacent to each Gulf coastal State.

“(2) FAILURE TO TRANSFER MANAGEMENT.—If the certification described in subsection (a)(1) is not made the transfer of management described in subsection (a)(2)(B) may not be accomplished and the Secretary shall remain responsible for management of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper.

“SEC. 505. OVERSIGHT OF GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

“(a) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not later than December 1 of the year following the transfer of management described in section 504(a)(2), and at any other time the GRSRMA considers appropriate after that date, the GRSRMA shall determine if—

“(1) each Gulf coastal State has fully adopted and implemented the red snapper fishery management plan approved under section 503 for such State;

“(2) each such plan continues to be in compliance with the standards for sustainability provided by the GRSRMA pursuant to section 503(a)(2); and

“(3) the enforcement of the plan by each Gulf coastal State is satisfactory to maintain the long-term sustainability and abundance of Gulf of Mexico red snapper.

“(b) OVERFISHING AND REBUILDING PLANS.—

“(1) CERTIFICATION.—If the Gulf of Mexico red snapper in the coastal waters adjacent to a Gulf coastal State is experiencing overfishing or is subject to a rebuilding plan, such Gulf coastal State shall submit a certification to the GRSRMA showing that such State—

“(A) has implemented the necessary measures to end overfishing or rebuild the fishery; and

“(B) in consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, has implemented a program to provide for data collection adequate to monitor the harvest of Gulf of Mexico red snapper by such State.

“(2) NOTIFICATION TO SECRETARY.—If, after such time as determined by the GRSRMA, a Gulf coastal State that submitted a certification under paragraph (1) has not implemented the measures and requirements described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of such paragraph, the GRSRMA shall vote on whether to notify the Secretary of a recommendation of closure of the red snapper fishery in the waters adjacent to the State territorial waters of the Gulf coastal State.

“(c) CLOSURE OF THE GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER FISHERY.—

“(1) CONDITIONS FOR CLOSURE.—Not later than 60 days after the receipt of a notice under subsection (b)(2) for a Gulf coastal State, the Secretary may declare a closure of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery within the waters adjacent to the State territorial waters of the Gulf coastal State.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—Prior to making a declaration under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consider the comments of such Gulf coastal State and the GRSRMA.

“(3) ACTIONS PROHIBITED DURING CLOSURE.—During a closure of the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery under paragraph (1), it is unlawful for any person—

“(A) to engage in fishing for Gulf of Mexico red snapper within the waters adjacent to the State territorial waters of the Gulf coastal State covered by the closure;

“(B) to land, or attempt to land, the Gulf of Mexico red snapper in the area of the closure; or

“(C) to fail to return to the water any Gulf of Mexico red snapper caught in the area of the closure that are incidental to commercial harvest or in the recreational fisheries.

“(4) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Secretary to close the red snapper fishery in the State territorial waters of a Gulf coastal State.

“SEC. 506. GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION.

“(a) FUNDING TO THE GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION.—The Secretary shall provide all Federal funding to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission for all necessary stock assessments, research, and management for the red snapper fishery.

“(b) FUNDING TO THE GULF COASTAL STATES.—The Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission shall be responsible for administering the Federal funds referred to in paragraph (1) to each of the Gulf coastal States for proper management of the red snapper fishery.

“(c) NO ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Nothing in this section may be construed to increase the amount of Federal funds authorized to be appropriated for Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery management.

“SEC. 507. NO EFFECT ON MANAGEMENT OF SHRIMP FISHERIES IN FEDERAL WATERS.

“(a) BYCATCH REDUCTION DEVICES.—Nothing in this title may be construed to effect any requirement related to the use of Gulf of Mexico red snapper bycatch reduction devices in the course of shrimp trawl fishing activity.

“(b) BYCATCH OF RED SNAPPER.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to apply to or affect in any manner the Federal management of commercial shrimp fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico as in effect on the date of the enactment of this section, including any incidental catch of red snapper”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

□ 1715

(1) DATA COLLECTION.—Section 401(g)(3)(C) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1881(g)(3)(G)) is amended by striking “and” after the semicolon at the end of clause (iv), by striking the period at the end of clause (v) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) in the case of each fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, taking into consideration all data collection activities related to fishery effort that are undertaken by the marine resources division of each relevant State of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.”.

(2) GULF STATE TERRITORIAL WATERS.—Section 306(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1856(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Notwithstanding section 3(11) and subsection (a) of this section, for purposes of managing fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico, the seaward boundary of a coastal State in the Gulf of Mexico is a line three marine leagues seaward from the baseline from which the territorial sea of the United States is measured.”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in the first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE V—TRANSFER TO STATES OF MANAGEMENT OF RED SNAPPER FISHERIES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

“Sec. 501. Short title.

“Sec. 502. Definitions.

“Sec. 503. Management of Gulf of Mexico red snapper.

“Sec. 504. State implementation of the red snapper fishery management plans.

“Sec. 505. Oversight of Gulf of Mexico red snapper management.

“Sec. 506. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

“Sec. 507. No effect on management of shrimp fisheries in Federal waters.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I was a child growing up in south Louisiana, recreational fishing for red snapper, we were allowed to go out all year round. All year long, we could go out and go enjoy fishing with our family and access the bounties of the Gulf of Mexico.

As a matter of fact, the Gulf of Mexico is so productive, we don't just have great recreational fishing in south Louisiana; we have great commercial as well. We have some of the best restaurants in the Nation.

We have a very robust commercial fishing industry. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it is the second biggest commercial fishing industry only to the State of Alaska, which I think is unfair because they get to weigh their crab shells.

Mr. Chairman, the reality is that we have seen the National Marine Fisheries Service, over the last several years, continue to use science that is not as robust as what the States are using to manage their fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, access for the recreational fishermen went down from year round when I was a child. Even in the 1990s, it was nearly 200 days, down to this year, where the National Marine Fisheries Service says that it is limited to only 10 days for recreational fishing. Parents and their children can go out for 10 days.

Meanwhile, for the first time ever, the National Marine Fisheries Service has split up the charter for hire and the recreational to allow the charter for hire to go out for 45 days and effectively allow the commercial fishermen to go out year round.

I want to be clear, Mr. Chairman. This isn't about pitting the different fishing sectors against one another. What this is about is ensuring that we are using the best science and ensuring that we are providing access to all fishers—the recreational, the charter for hire, and the commercial. It needs to be based upon the best science. We can have much better management of that resource by ensuring consistency between State waters and Federal waters.

The five Gulf States have come up with a plan. Unanimously, the five Gulf States have come up with a plan to manage those fisheries by the five fish and game agencies among the five Gulf States.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply codifies that agreement of the five Gulf States and allows those States to manage the red snapper fishery identical to how the striped bass fishery is managed on the Atlantic coast.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed to see this amendment back again after it failed to pass in committee.

I understand that recreational fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico want to be able to keep more of the red snapper they catch, but the solution is not to steal fish from a responsibly managed and accountable commercial sector that provides millions of Americans the opportunity to choose healthy, fresh, sustainable Gulf red snapper at stores and restaurants; nor is it the solution to hand management over to Gulf States before they have developed a plan for managing the resource that consists of more than just “trust us.”

Simple arithmetic shows that there are too many people putting too much pressure on the red snapper stock just to sustain a recreational fishing season that lasts for more than a few days. To address that problem, private boat anglers will need to present creative solutions such as those that the commercial and charter for hire sectors have developed.

NOAA is doing an incredible job rebuilding this stock under Magnuson,

and the Gulf Council has the ability to debate and adopt a regional management approach or other alternative management strategies without interference from Washington.

I urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Louisiana on the current status of red snapper management in the Gulf of Mexico and your interest to support actions taken by the Gulf States that are supported by many of your constituents.

The amendment being offered today is a start in the process, but I respectfully suggest it needs further discussion. I support regional solutions but have concerns with proposals that will take the red snapper fishery outside of the Magnuson-Stevens Act management process.

I am willing to continue to work with the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman BISHOP, and other Members, as well as fishing groups involved, to try to find a resolution to the management issues impacting the red snapper fishery.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is supported by the American Sportfishing Association; the Billfish Foundation; CCA, the Coastal Conservation Association; the Center for Coastal Conservation; the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation; the International Game Fish Association; National Marine Manufacturers Association; Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation; Recreational Fishing Alliance; and the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership.

Mr. Chairman, I am struggling with understanding the concerns that I recently heard expressed by the other side.

Mr. Chairman, this is identical to how the Atlantic striped bass is managed on our East Coast. Why is there not an amendment to withdraw that authority if it is so problematic to have the five Gulf States consistently manage the natural resources in their State waters, as they do today, and in the adjacent Federal waters?

It has been proven through various hearings that the committee has had that the science being used by the States is much better than the science that is being used by the Federal Government.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in the RECORD a one-pager that was released by the various groups that I

cited, and I would also like to include in the RECORD a document that was written in March of this year by the five Gulf States that explains the management.

THE STATE-BASED SOLUTION TO GULF OF MEXICO RED SNAPPER

In March 2015, the directors of the state fish and wildlife agencies from Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas announced an agreement for state-based management of Gulf of Mexico red snapper, which in recent years has experienced increasing privatization of this public resource and decreasing recreational fishing opportunities.

Gulf of Mexico red snapper is presently managed by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, under the National Marine Fisheries Service. The states' agreement, which is predicated on transferring management authority away from the Council, describes the key elements of a plan in which the five Gulf states would coordinate management of red snapper throughout the Gulf of Mexico through the proposed Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority.

Numerous regional and national fisheries organizations have come out in support of the states' plan. The recreational fishing community has long had a strong relationship with state fish and wildlife agencies because of their ability to manage fisheries resources in a way that allows for healthy populations and public access. Most of the nation's most popular saltwater recreational fisheries are managed by the states. Rarely, if ever, does overfishing occur in state-managed recreational fisheries.

States are also tremendously successful at managing commercial fisheries. Nothing in the Gulf states' plan proposes to change how the commercial red snapper fishery is managed.

It has become abundantly clear that the current Gulf red snapper management system cannot produce successful outcomes for recreational fishermen. Somewhere along the way of rebuilding the fishery, to where it's now at an abundance level beyond anyone's expectations, management went off the tracks. A new path forward is needed, the states' are to be commended for their willingness to take on this task.

Representatives Garret Graves of Louisiana and Jeff Miller of Florida are championing this plan. They are working to ensure congressional action on this issue aligns with the five Gulf states.

MARCH 13, 2015.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: Management of the red snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico continues to be a major challenge with increasing dissatisfaction among anglers and serious calls for restructuring the Gulf red snapper management system. As a result, a number of proposals and various drafts of legislation for changing this system have emerged. Recognizing that significant changes are being considered, the marine fisheries directors from the five Gulf States have been engaged in an effort to develop and document an alternative to the current management strategy that has mutual agreement and support. Together, we have developed a framework for cooperative state-based management of Gulf red snapper; the enclosed document outlines the conceptual elements of that plan.

Under this alternative concept, the Gulf States would coordinate management of red snapper throughout the Gulf of Mexico through a new, independent body called the Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority (GSRMSA). The GSRMSA would be comprised of the principle marine fisheries

managers from each Gulf States, and the management authority for Gulf-red snapper would no longer reside within the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council.

The GSRMSA framework outlines a straightforward process that would allow states to use flexible management approaches to manage red snapper to meet local needs as well as Gulf-wide conservation goals. Each state would be responsible for all management of red snapper in their respective state and adjacent federal waters. The GSRMSA would approve each state's management plan, coordinate population assessments, provide consistent accountability measures, and distribute federal funding for research, assessment, and management.

Each state fisheries management agency places great value in working together in partnership and collaboration to ensure we have a robust, sustainable, and accessible red snapper fishery in the Gulf. The states recognize the importance of the red snapper fishery to the fabric and identity of local communities throughout the Gulf as well as the tremendous economic impact that it provides each state.

Thank you for the opportunity to present to you the GSRMSA concept agreed upon by each state. If there are any questions or comments about the concept, please do not hesitate to contact any of us directly.

Sincerely,

ROBIN RIECHERS,
Director of Coastal Fisheries, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department.

RANDY PAUSINA,
Assistant Secretary, Office of Fisheries, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

JAMIE MILLER,
Executive Director, Mississippi Department of Marine Resources.

CHRIS BLANKENSHIP,
Director, Marine Resources Division, Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

JESSICA MCCAWLEY,
Director, Division of Marine Fisheries Management, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Enclosure.

GULF STATES RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (GSRMSA)

This document outlines elements of a plan in which the Gulf States would coordinate management of red snapper throughout the Gulf of Mexico through the Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority (GSRMSA).

MANAGEMENT

The governing body of GSRMSA would be comprised of the principal fisheries manager (or his/her proxy) from each of the five Gulf States. There would be a rotating chair serving a two-year term. All actions of GSRMSA would be by majority vote. The primary function of the GSRMSA would be approval of each state's or group of states' Red Snapper Fisheries Management Plan (hereafter referred to as the Plan) which would address all components (commercial and recreational) of the Gulf States red snapper fishery. The Plan may extend to multiple years with annual review of specific components to include, but not limited to: assess-

ment methodology, data collection, annual management measures and timelines.

The Plan would include an initial three-year prohibition on any actions that might affect individual fishing quotas or management structure of the commercial fishery, effective from date of adoption by GSRMSA. During this period, NOAA Fisheries through the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council would continue to manage the commercial fishery under existing regulations.

Each state would be responsible for the management of the fishery in their respective state territorial sea and adjacent exclusive economic zone (EEZ) water using the best available science and information. The states would be required to ensure overfishing will not occur through the full range of management and assessment strategies available to each state or group of states acting in concert. These strategies would not be limited to those based on total allowable catch. The GSRMSA, as a whole would annually review and approve the red snapper management actions of an individual state or groups of states acting in concert. If the status of the fishery in each state is in equilibrium or expanding, no change in management actions may be required. If the status of the fishery is below equilibrium or declining, the responsible state or states would be required to take appropriate action to revise existing management actions to establish equilibrium, and those actions would have to be approved by the GSRMSA.

The GSRMSA or each state would be required to prepare an annual report on the status of the fishery based on the individual states (or states acting in concert) management strategies and assessment methodologies. The GSRMSA will conduct a periodic gulf-wide population review of red snapper on a schedule not to exceed every 5 years.

ASSESSMENT

Each individual state or group of states would conduct an assessment of the status of red snapper populations within their adjacent waters. The full range of assessment methodologies would be available to each state or group of states using the best available science to inform management actions.

Assessments would be conducted periodically on a timeline determined by the GSRMSA. Assessment methodologies and data collection strategies for both fisheries dependent and independent data would be approved by the GSRMSA. The GSRMSA would be required to conduct a periodic and Gulf-wide population review of the health of the fishery and status of red snapper on a schedule not to exceed five years between such assessments.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Each Gulf state would formally agree to comply fully with management measures developed through the GSRMSA-approved Plan under a memorandum of agreement. The GSRMSA could request additional accountability actions through the Secretary of Commerce if a Gulf state or group of Gulf states adopted management measures or regulations significantly inconsistent with the red snapper management framework identified in the Plan when such inconsistent measures could negatively impact the interests of other Gulf states with regard to red snapper management.

The procedures established as part of the Striped Bass Act, Sec. 5153—Monitoring of Implementation and Enforcement by Coastal States would serve as a model for developing procedures for action through the Secretary of Commerce specific to the red snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. Federal action to provide accountability and ensure consistency would be limited to the federal waters adjacent to the state(s) that adopted inconsistent management measures or actions.

Under no circumstances would federal authority or action supersede that of an individual state within designated state waters. The following link provides greater detail on the procedures used by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission in regards to management of striped bass: http://www.asmfc.org/uploads/file/Striped_Bass_Act.pdf

State regulation of red snapper would extend seaward from a state's shoreline to the 200 mile limit (Figure 1). Individual states would enforce regulations within their boundaries under licensing to that state or with agreement and appropriate licensing in other adjacent states. State regulations related to red snapper under the Plan would apply to all fishing activities associated with red snapper landed in a given state, not just state registered vessels.

State waters for all Gulf States would extend to nine nautical miles for the purpose of uniform enforcement and management actions related to red snapper.

FUNDING

Federal funding specific to red snapper now going to federal research, assessment and management would be appropriated to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and passed through to the states for use and distribution under the GRSRMA.

Federal funding of enforcement that is currently provided to the Gulf States for fisheries enforcement shall not be reduced because of transfer of red snapper management to GRSRMA. Federal agents will work in concert with deputized state agents to enforce state regulations approved by the GRSRMA.

The National Marine Fisheries Service will continue to provide access to all fisheries data and services available before transfer of red snapper management under the same arrangements and conditions after the transfer of management authority to GRSRMA.

Figure 1. Jurisdictional boundaries designated for enforcement purposes at a state level. These boundaries may be adjusted based on state(s) exercising the option to work in concert on regulations with each other.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

In order to establish the GRSRMA, the management of red snapper must be vacated from the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan and any provisions that have been established for red snapper with that plan or any amendments to that plan.

Additionally, this Act and any provisions of this Act regarding management and enforcement of any regulations and management provisions to the extent that there is any conflict will take precedence over the MSA and any portions of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan.

KEY PROVISIONS

GULF STATES RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY (GRSRMA)

This document provides a summary of the key elements of a plan in which the Gulf states would coordinate management of red snapper throughout the Gulf of Mexico through the proposed Gulf States Red Snapper Management Authority (GRSRMA).

MANAGEMENT & ASSESSMENT

The governing body for the GRSRMA would be comprised of the principal fisheries manager (or his/her proxy) from each of the five Gulf States.

Primary function of the GRSRMA would be approval of each state's Red Snapper Fisheries Management Plan which would address all components of the fishery.

Within each Plan there would be an initial three year prohibition on actions affecting individual fishing quotas.

Using the best available science, each state would be responsible for the management of the fishery in their respective state territorial sea and adjacent exclusive economic zone (EEZ) waters to ensure that overfishing would not occur.

Reporting requirements will include an annual report on the status of the fishery from each state(s) and a gulf-wide population review will be conducted at least every 5 years.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Each state would formally agree to comply fully with management measures developed through the GRSRMA-approved Plan.

The GRSRMA could request additional accountability actions through the Secretary of Commerce if a Gulf state or group of Gulf states adopted management measures or regulations significantly inconsistent with the Plan.

Any accountability action based on a request to the Secretary of Commerce would be limited to federal waters adjacent to the state or states that adopted measures inconsistent with the Plan.

State regulations and enforcement of those regulations for red snapper would extend seaward from a state's shoreline to the 200 mile limit.

State waters for all Gulf States would extend to nine nautical miles for the purpose of uniform enforcement and management actions related to red snapper.

FUNDING

Federal funding for research, assessment and management of red snapper would be appropriated to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and passed to the states.

Federal funding for fisheries enforcement shall continue at current levels and NMFS will continue to share fisheries data and other data necessary for management after transfer of authority.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Provisions of this Act will take precedence over the MSA and any portions of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the distinguished chairman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in the same way Federal lands must be accessible to sportsmen and -women, so must our Federal waters as well.

I concur with the gentleman that there is an access problem with the red snapper. The underlying bill extends the Gulf State coastal waters to 9 miles, requires fish to be counted around reefs, and requires the incorporation of State and local data on red snapper management so that the red snapper population will be counted.

Almost everyone agrees that the population is undercounted, but counting more fish does not guarantee that recreational fishermen will have more days in Federal waters.

I want to work with the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and any other coastal States Representatives to have hearings and move along other bills that may come about.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just want to say that I appreciate Chairman BISHOP's offer to move legislation that

the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and I will be introducing soon that pertains to this exact issue and to have hearings on this as well.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, in Louisiana, we fish—whether that's enjoying a Saturday on the water for fun or making a living as a commercial or charter fisherman.

That's why I stand with my Louisiana colleague, GARRET GRAVES, in support of this common-sense amendment.

As an expert on policies affecting our Gulf Coast, Congressman GRAVES knows it is rare for all 5 Gulf states to agree when it comes to ocean management and conservation policy.

So it's remarkable when these 5 states come together on a proposal to transfer Red Snapper management in the Gulf of Mexico away from the federally managed program that continues to fail recreational anglers.

That's all this common-sense amendment does—make this existing management agreement into law.

I believe as Representative GRAVES does when states come together to present a working proposal to Congress, we as their Representatives should listen.

I urge my colleagues to support states' rights and support this amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. With that, I withdraw the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-128.

Mr. WITTMAN. 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:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. 29. AUTHORITY TO USE ALTERNATIVE FISHERY MANAGEMENT MEASURES.

Section 302(h) (16 U.S.C. 1852(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (9); and

(2) 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.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would give the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, Fisheries the authority to implement management practices better suited to the nature and scope of recreational fishing.

I hope we can all agree that commercial and recreational fisheries are fundamentally different activities, with dissimilar harvest data collection systems that can benefit from different management techniques.

Commercial fisheries are managed for yield. Commercial landings can usually be counted or weighed in realtime; thus, quotas can be enforced in realtime. This allows managers to close a fishery well before the allowable catch is exceeded. In short, a commercial fishery's catch can be managed in realtime based on data from verified landings.

Recreational fisheries are different and should be managed for expectation, as opposed to yield. Anglers fish for a variety of reasons, but a lack of fish will make them go less frequently or stop altogether. Anglers and fishermen need to believe they will have opportunity to encounter fish, with the hopes they may catch some, possibly including some large enough to take home.

Instead of yield, abundance and age structure are key elements to recreational fisheries since those factors govern both the rate of encounters and the size of fish caught. Maximizing yield has little meaning in most recreational fisheries. That is why NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service should manage recreational fisheries based on expected long-term harvest rates, not strictly on yield or poundage-based quotas.

This strategy has been successfully used by State fisheries managers in our freshwater and coastal fisheries, providing exceptional recreational fishing opportunities while ensuring sustainable fish populations.

By managing the recreational sector based on harvest rate as opposed to a poundage-based quota, managers have been able to provide predictability in regulations while also sustaining a healthy population.

While the Magnuson-Stevens Act does not specifically prohibit such an approach, it should specifically direct the National Marine Fisheries Service and regional councils to consider alternative strategies to commercial management for appropriate recreationally valuable fisheries.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that provides additional flexibility to improve the management of important recreational fisheries.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I understand and appreciate the motivation behind the gentleman's amendment. Recreational fisheries are inherently different from commercial fisheries. The language is similar to the alternative rebuilding strategy section in the underlying bill, one of the few parts that does not harm conservation efforts.

However, that provision states clearly that the alternative strategies must be in compliance with the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, including ending overfishing, setting

science-based catch limits, and sticking to rebuilding timelines.

This amendment does not include those safeguards and, therefore, could be construed as to allow overfishing or delay the rebuilding of overfished stock. We have made too much progress in managing fisheries to back-track now.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman from Arizona that this amendment does not in any way stop National Marine Fisheries Service or the councils from preventing overfishing and making the needed changes to management.

This bill purely provides them the flexibility and adaptability to properly manage recreational fisheries which, as the gentleman from Arizona said, we all know are different than those commercial fisheries.

I want to make sure that they have the opportunity to manage the fisheries properly and especially in light of recreational fishermen and the local economies that depend on viable, sustainable recreational fisheries.

We know that we have to make sure we are making good resource decisions, and we do that by providing that flexibility and adaptability. This amendment allows us to do that.

It allows recreational fisheries and the management thereof to be treated different than commercial fisheries which we have all seen through time we must do if we are to manage them in the best interest not only of the resource itself—that is the fish—but to manage it in the best interest of our recreational fishermen and the economies that depend on them.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, without the safeguards that are included in the Magnuson-Stevens Act being part of this amendment, we continue to recommend a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-128.

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:

Strike all and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fishing Economy Improvement Act".

SEC. 2. 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.).

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(1a) The term 'artisanal fishing' means subsistence or small scale traditional fishing involving fishing households (as opposed to commercial companies)—

"(A) using a relatively small amount of capital and energy and relatively small fishing vessels (if any);

"(B) making short fishing trips, close to shore; and

"(C) mainly for local consumption.";

(2) by inserting after paragraph (27) the following:

"(27a) The term 'marine aquaculture' means the propagation and rearing of aquatic species in controlled or selected environments in the exclusive economic zone."; and

(3) in paragraph (16), by adding at the end the following: "Such term does not include marine aquaculture.".

SEC. 4. 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 website of the Council—

"(i) to the extent practicable, a Web cast or a live audio or video broadcast of each meeting of the Council, and of the Council Coordination Committee established under subsection (1), that is not closed in accordance with paragraph (3); and

"(ii) an audio or video recording (if the meeting was in person or by video conference), or a searchable audio recording or written transcript, of each meeting of the Council and of the meetings of committees referred to in section 302(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) subparagraph (G)."

SEC. 5. INCLUSION OF ARTISANAL FISHING SECTORS IN FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Section 303(a)(13) (16 U.S.C. 1853(a)(13)) is amended by inserting "artisanal," after "include a description of the commercial, recreational,".

SEC. 6. IMPROVING FISHERIES DATA COLLECTION.

(a) ELECTRONIC MONITORING.—

(1) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue guidance regarding the use of electronic monitoring for the purposes of monitoring fisheries that are subject to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(B) CONTENT.—The guidance shall—

(i) distinguish between monitoring for data collection and research purposes and monitoring for compliance and enforcement purposes; and

(ii) include minimum criteria, objectives, or performance standards for electronic monitoring.

(C) PROCESS.—In issuing the guidance the Secretary shall—

(i) consult with the Regional Fishery Management Councils and interstate fishery management commissions;

(ii) publish the proposed guidance; and
 (iii) provide an opportunity for the submission by the public of comments on the proposed guidance.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), and after the issuance of the final guidance, a Council, or the Secretary for fisheries referred to in section 302(a)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(3)), may, in accordance with the guidance, on a fishery-by-fishery basis and consistent with the existing objectives and management goals of a fishery management plan and the Act for a fishery issued by the Council or the Secretary, respectively, amend such plan—

(i) to incorporate electronic monitoring as an alternative tool for data collection and monitoring purposes or for compliance and enforcement purposes (or both); and

(ii) to allow for the replacement of a percentage of on-board observers with electronic monitoring.

(B) **COMPARABILITY.**—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to a fishery only if the Council or Secretary, respectively, determines that such monitoring will yield comparable data collection and compliance results.

(3) **PILOT PROJECTS.**—Before the issuance of final guidance, a Council, or the Secretary for fisheries referred to in section 302(a)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(a)(3)), may, subject to the requirements of such Act, on a fishery-by-fishery basis, and consistent with the existing objectives and management goals of a fishery management plan for a fishery issued by the Council or the Secretary, respectively, conduct a pilot project for the use of electronic monitoring for the fishery.

(4) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall issue final guidance under this subsection not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **VIDEO AND ACOUSTIC SURVEY TECHNOLOGIES.**—The Secretary shall work with the Regional Fishery Management Councils and nongovernmental entities to develop and implement the use pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) of video survey technologies and expanded use of acoustic survey technologies.

SEC. 7. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **PLAN.**—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) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Fishing Economy Improvement 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, including for data-poor stocks for which limited scientific or commercial information is available, 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 include 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.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “in consultation with the Secretary.” and inserting “. Each Council shall provide a list of such needs to the Secretary on an annual basis, identifying and prioritizing such needs.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “FUNDING” and inserting “PRIORITIES”; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking all after “including” and inserting an em dash, followed on the next line by the following:

“(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 and satellite tracking systems such as vessel monitoring systems (VMS) on small vessels.”.

(b) **ZEKE GRADER FISHERIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT FUND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 208 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 1891b) is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting “ZEKE GRADER” before “FISHERIES CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT FUND”;

(B) in subsection (a), by inserting “Zeke Grader” before “Fisheries Conservation and Management Fund”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “Fishery Conservation and Management Fund” each place it appears and inserting “Zeke Grader Fisheries Conservation and Management Fund”.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 208. Zeke Grader Fisheries Conservation and Management Fund.”.

(3) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the “Fisheries Conservation and Management Fund” is deemed to be a reference to the “Zeke Grader Fisheries Conservation and Management Fund”.

SEC. 8. GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND RED SNAPPER MANAGEMENT.

(a) **REPORTING AND DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) in conjunction with the States, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and the recreational fishing sectors, develop and implement a real-time reporting and data collection program for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery using available technology; and

(2) make implementation of this subsection a priority for funds received by the Secretary and allocated to the Gulf of Mexico region under section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (commonly known as the “Saltonstall-Kennedy Act”) (15 U.S.C. 713c-3).

(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 Cen-

ter 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.

SEC. 9. RECREATIONAL FISHING DATA.

(a) **RECREATIONAL DATA COLLECTION.**—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 that are exempted under paragraph (2).

“(B) **GUIDANCE.**—The Secretary shall develop guidance, in cooperation with the States, that details best practices for administering State programs that are exempted under paragraph (2), and provide such guidance to the States.

“(C) **BIENNIAL REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress and publish biennial reports that include—

“(i) the estimated accuracy of the registry program established under paragraph (1) and of State programs that are exempted under paragraph (2);

“(ii) priorities for improving recreational fishing data collection; and

“(iii) an explanation of any use of information collected by such State programs and by the Secretary, including a description of any consideration given to the information by the Secretary.

“(D) **STATE GRANT PROGRAM.**—The Secretary shall make grants to States to improve implementation of State programs consistent with this subsection. The Secretary shall prioritize such grants based on the ability of the grant to improve the quality and accuracy of such programs.”.

(b) **STUDY OF RECREATIONAL FISHERIES DATA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to study the implementation of the programs described in section 401 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1881). The study shall—

(A) provide an updated assessment of recreational survey methods established or improved since the publication of the Council’s report entitled “Review of Recreational Fisheries Survey Methods (2006)”;

(B) evaluate the extent to which the recommendations made in that report were implemented pursuant to subsection (g)(3)(B) of that section; and

(C) examine any limitations of the Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey and the marine recreational information program established under subsection (g)(3)(A) of that section.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after entering into an agreement under paragraph (1) the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 10. 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 2016 through 2021”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a

Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of our amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I do want to express my respect and appreciation for the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and his commitment to fisheries management issues over the years. I know many Members, including myself, are very concerned about the sustainability of the fishing industry in our own districts.

I represent about a third of the California coast, including many working coastal communities; and the importance of marine fisheries to my district and, I would say, to our country cannot be overstated.

U.S. fisheries have not only shaped the cultural identity of coastal communities, such as those I represent and our country, but they have also contributed economically in a very significant way, nearly \$90 billion and 1.5 million jobs.

□ 1730

Recreational fishing provides important opportunities to bring families and communities together, and, of course, subsistence fishing is a culturally significant tradition that provides an important food source for many people.

However, I do not believe that H.R. 1335 represents a constructive approach to ensuring abundant resources for current and future generations of fishermen. This bill would take us backward in many respects. It would roll back important elements of the Magnuson Act that are critical to making fisheries and the fishing industry in the United States economically and environmentally sustainable. I also don't believe that successful fisheries management has to include taking potshots at bedrock environmental laws like the Endangered Species Act, the Antiquities Act, and NEPA, as this bill seeks to do. For these reasons, I can't support it.

Congress first enacted the Magnuson-Stevens Act in 1976, with two main goals: first, to put an end to unregulated fishing by foreign fleets in U.S. waters, and, second, to develop domestic fleets that could reap the economic benefit of our considerable fisheries resources. It worked, and it worked so well that domestic fishing soon replaced foreign fleets in overexploiting U.S. fisheries.

The 1996 reauthorization required regional fisheries management councils, for the first time, to end domestic overfishing and to develop rebuilding plans, and then the 2007 reauthorization added an important timeline for rebuilding plans and also enforced catch limits. The original law, together with these amendments, established a fisheries management system in the

United States that is now a model for the rest of the world.

The important point here is that all three of these acts were bipartisan bills, developed and approved by Republicans and Democrats alike, because everybody recognized the need to maintain sustainable fish stocks and to support domestic commercial and recreational fishing. Now, these were also effective progressive endeavors that drastically improved the fisheries in our country. In fact, our Federal fisheries today have the lowest ever number of stocks that are overfished or subject to overfishing, and a total of 37 stocks have been rebuilt. This is evidence that our science-based approach to determining stock status and the managing for sustainability is working.

But contrary to previous bipartisan acts of Congress, this bill was developed with very little input from Democrats. Subsequently, it was passed out of committee on a strict party-line vote—no Democrats voting in favor and not a single Democratic amendment accepted. Every witness at each hearing that the committee held on this topic in the last Congress agreed on one thing: the Magnuson-Stevens Act was largely working.

This is not a situation where we should be overhauling the law in a wholesale way. It is a situation where we should be making small improvements so that the law can continue to work well into the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we want to have meaningful discussions with our Republican colleagues and develop bipartisan legislation in the spirit of previous successful Magnuson Act authorizations. To this end, I introduced the Fishing Economy Improvement Act with my friend, Mr. SABLAN, and we are offering a germane version as a substitute amendment that would reauthorize Magnuson and leave intact the core conservation and management provisions, including the requirements to rebuild overfished stocks and set annual catch limits.

The substitute amendment would also make improvements to the act. It would prioritize cooperation between scientists and fishermen on research efforts, a collaboration that produces useful information, breeds confidence in the system, and improves management outcomes. It infuses new funding into cooperative research, allowing the agency to accept outside funding, and it modernizes fishery collection and management by encouraging the use of electronic monitoring.

The amendment makes improvements to the operations of the regional fishery management councils, as well, by increasing transparency and public participation in the process; and it requires that the councils consider the interests of Native Alaskans, Pacific Islanders, and American Indians, who often depend on fish for their livelihoods, in fishery management plans.

Our hope is that we can use this reauthorization process to start a thought-

ful, constructive, and bipartisan conversation about fisheries management in the United States. At a time when our oceans face many stressors, including the combined effects of pollution, acidification, and ocean warming, it is essential that we reauthorize Magnuson and build on the act's legacy of successful science-based management.

Mr. Chairman, the fishermen and coastal communities I represent and those whom my colleagues represent deserve that conversation; and, more importantly, they deserve a bill that honors the decades of work that have gone into making American fishery management more sustainable, both economically and ecologically. I urge my colleagues to support our substitute amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the amendment that has been presented by the gentleman from California. It is a much better amendment than was presented in the committee in which there were elements that were in there that dealt with the California drought, that dealt with NGOs being able to contribute that should never have been a part of it, and I appreciate his not putting those in this particular amendment that is on the floor. But at the same time, it does roll back all the flexibility that was significant and important here. It rolls back the transparency that needs to be in effect.

The underlying bill specifically requires the scientific and statistical committees to develop the scientific advice provided to the councils in a transparent manner and allows them to allow for public involvement in the process. It requires councils to provide Webcasts or audio of each council meeting and posting such recordings on their Web site within 30 days of that particular meeting, and it requires an opportunity for public comment or proposals that are relating to the use of electronic monitoring technology. Those would also not be included if this amendment were to take place.

Some of the "bedrock" laws that are referred to here are indeed not taken out of the process. That was handled in one of the other debates we had on a different amendment, which simply says what we are trying to do is avoid just going through the motions a second time, to try and cut the red tape for more efficiency so that a NEPA law or fish management act, they are the same thing, why do it twice when once is sufficient? Why waste the time, energy, and effort of public bodies to do that? And all those, once again, would be reinstated, that double effort would be reinstated at the same time.

With that, Mr. Chairman, this bill, as a 4-year process, not a recent process,

goes back to several other times. And in my opening statement, I did quote from the leadership of the minority party at the time 2 years ago, in that committee, how much they were grateful for the input they had on this bill and for taking ideas from the Democrat side that were incorporated, and those ideas are still in the base bill.

It is one of the concepts here that I would love to have a bipartisan bill. But more importantly, I want to have a good bill, a bill that solves the problems. You have heard speeches from both sides of the aisle that simply the status quo is not working. There are too many problems that need to be solved. That is one of the reasons why the underlying bill is still being supported by all the people who are involved in the industry—by the commercial side, by the charter fishing side, and by the recreation people—and the first time that has ever happened.

So I commend the gentleman from Alaska for having done a good process, and I would say go with the underlying bill. It has a better chance of moving us forward to provide better progress and better significance in the future.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a district that certainly understands the importance of sustainable commercial and recreational fisheries.

Ms. PINGREE. I thank Mr. HUFFMAN for giving this opportunity and for caring so deeply about our coastal communities and our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Huffman-Sablan amendment because it would update the process we use to manage our Nation's fisheries without throwing away core programs. In particular, the Huffman-Sablan amendment would modernize fishery data collection by using electronic monitoring and fisheries survey technologies. These are the technologies that our fishermen need to update the current program, and they are the wave of the future—no pun intended.

I think it is helpful for all of us to recognize the fact that NOAA's budget for the so-called wet-side programs has been facing devastating cuts as well as the sequester cuts over the past several years. As a result, now more than ever, we need to look at about how we can make our dollars do more with our fisheries. Electronic monitoring is a place where we can make an investment in the future that will help our fishermen today.

Also, the substitute amendment will ensure that we leave intact conservation programs that have been helping us to address overfished stocks. In the Gulf of Maine, we have seen the crisis in our fisheries firsthand, and we want to make sure that we are not forgetting all the work that our men and women who make their livings on the water have done. We do not want to roll back important conservation and management guidelines.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I support the Huffman-Sablan amendment. I appreciate my colleagues for working on this, and I urge all of my other colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, I am pleased to report he has accepted some portion of our bill, but there is some question about the Endangered Species Act. We had a case in Alaska where NOAA, which I don't know how it happened, they put the Steller sea lion on endangered species because of fishing. There was no real connection between the fishing and the so-called decline in the Steller sea lions, and they killed a community with no science. We come to find out the Steller sea lion had moved away from the area where there was more abundant food, not from fishing. The fishing hadn't caused any problem at all, but it killed that community.

I argue that in this case, if any of the fishing is endangered, that is okay, the fish itself. But when you have a species hurt the fishing community and it didn't affect the sustainable yield, you see why I think this amendment is incorrect.

I think you have to consider, again, the purposes of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which originated in the House, was for sustainable fisheries and sustainable communities. When you have another act interfere with that, that doesn't have any science, then I think it is incorrect.

So I understand what the gentleman is saying. Electronically monitoring fisheries is good. The gentlewoman from Maine mentioned that. It is in the bill. There is a lot in this bill that is in the Sablan amendment. But what you are trying to suggest, you roll back the transparency and, I think, the community activity, which hurts the original base bill, which is the bill that I sponsored.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that the process for listing under the Endangered Species Act requires best available science. It is a very rigorous and public process, and it is subject to being challenged in various ways. So we think it is robust and has proven itself.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), who also represents a coastal State that understands the importance of sustainably managing our fisheries.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak in support of the Huffman-Sablan substitute amendment. This amendment would complement, rather than overhaul, the fishery management process in place under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, MSA.

While the current MSA may not be perfect, we have heard from many

groups again and again that it works. We have made incredible gains since the last reauthorization in 2007.

In its annual report issued in April, NOAA reported that the number of domestic fish stocks listed as overfished or subject to overfishing has dropped to an all-time low since 1997. Three more fish stocks were rebuilt to target levels in 2014, bringing the total number of rebuilt U.S. marine fish stocks to 37 since 2000. This amazing progress is a result of the combined efforts of NOAA, the regional fishery management councils, the fishing industry, and other stakeholders.

NOAA currently has pending proposals to tweak the implementation of MSA. That process should be allowed to continue. What is needed now are updates to the MSA that address specific issues that keep the law current, not a weakening of the law and roll-back of conservation measures such as those proposed in H.R. 1335.

H.R. 1335 would undermine the great improvements we have made to make our fisheries economically and environmentally sustainable, without addressing some important factors impacting our fisheries today. For example, I had hoped to offer an amendment to H.R. 1335 that would have product councils with a way of taking the effects of climate change into account when establishing annual catch limits and rebuilding timelines, but the Rules Committee declined to allow me to offer it on the floor today, despite the critical need for us to deal with the very real impacts that climate change is already having on our oceans and our fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Huffman-Sablan amendment, which would modernize the data collection and management of fisheries data, improve recreational fisheries data collection and reporting, and provide a way for NOAA to accept outside funding to support cooperative research efforts between scientists and fishermen.

□ 1745

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further, and I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of going through all these amendments. This is one amendment that does not necessarily move us forward in the process. I wish it did. It did not. Sometimes there are even little tiny bits and pieces that happen to be in there that are one of the reasons why, if we were starting from scratch again, I would ask to be removed.

For example, Mr. HUFFMAN does name one of the funds in here—the fisheries conservation and management fund—after a gentleman whose association's members have been party

to more than 20 Federal cases brought against the Federal agency since 2007. Much of that litigation has been aimed at the Bureau of Reclamation water projects and farmers and ranchers who serve by them. Congress should not be rewarding such serial litigation. That is one of the things I would have asked to have been removed had we started from scratch in this process.

But above all, the amendment simply erases the flexibility, erases the transparency, and erases the science improvements that are part of the underlying bill that are so essential; that the elements of those people who live in these communities, who recreate in these areas, who use the commercial side, the fishing side, have all said we are not doing what we need to do; that the present system does have flaws in it and needs to be changed, and we need to move forward on that bill. The underlying bill does that. This amendment does not do that.

I urge a “no” vote on this particular amendment and urge us to move forward with the bill as written.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, I am offering an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute for H.R. 1335, which was submitted to the Rules Committee by my colleague Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. Chair, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act is a sterling example of good federal policy and has helped make the United States the world leader in sustainable fisheries management.

When we last reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens in 2007, we required the use of annual catch limits to end and prevent overfishing.

Using this management tool—annual catch limits—we have increased the number of American fish stocks with populations sufficiently large that we can count on their ability to continue reproducing.

Using annual catch limits as our guide, we have reduced the number of stocks being fished in excess of maximum sustainable yield—to an all-time low.

Magnuson-Stevens has proven to be effective environmental policy.

It is also good economic policy.

U.S. fisheries contributed nearly \$90 billion and 1.5 million jobs to the economy in 2012. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates that, when we have fully rebuilt our fisheries, they will add another \$31 billion to our national economy and produce 500,000 new jobs.

Of course, we learn as we go; and there are ways that Magnuson-Stevens could be made even more effective as environmental and economic policy. The Huffman-Sablan amendment in the nature of a substitute provides some of that fine-tuning.

And our amendment does that without undermining the annual catch limits regime and other core principles that have made Magnuson-Stevens so effective.

H.R. 1335, on the other hand, risks backsliding on the progress we have made.

I recognize that some of these issues are technical in nature, but bear with me.

H.R. 1335 would allow non-target stocks in a fishery to be defined as ecosystem component species, which are not subject to annual

catch limits, even if these non-target stocks are depleted or overfished. For instance, H.R. 1335 would allow Atlantic halibut to be reclassified as an ecosystem component species, no longer subject to an annual catch limit. Yet, Atlantic halibut today are finally rebuilding after decades of decline. H.R. 1335 would put that progress at risk.

Another problem with H.R. 1335 is that it tries to conform the timelines in the National Environmental Policy Act with timelines in Magnuson-Stevens. This could force the Secretary of Commerce to approve fishery management plans that have not had the full benefit of National Environmental Policy Act analysis—particularly, by reducing the amount of time that the public has to comment on federal action. I do not think we want to be cutting the public out of this important decision-making process.

A third problem area for H.R. 1335 is that it prohibits information sharing. Fisheries data collected by NOAA in the process of administering Magnuson-Stevens could not be used in the management of other marine resources managed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, the Antiquities Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Nor could the Magnuson-Stevens fisheries data be used in managing offshore energy exploration and development, or water pollution, or coastal resources. That does not really make much sense.

The substitute amendment Mr. HUFFMAN and I are offering avoids these pitfalls. We simply want to improve fisheries research and management to benefit fishermen and fishing communities.

How does our amendment do that?

By implementing electronic monitoring to lower costs for the fishing fleet;

By improving the collection of fisheries data, which we all agree is lacking;

By increasing cooperative research and management efforts between scientists and fishermen;

By making the operations of the Regional Fishery Management Councils more transparent and open to public participation;

By allowing the Councils to select individuals who have expertise on subsistence fishing practices, so we incorporate the interests and expertise of Alaska Natives, Pacific Islanders, and Indian Tribes; and

By recognizing the subsistence fishing may encompass more than personal consumption, but also includes some small-scale, low technology, commercial fishing.

And our amendment makes these improvements in Magnuson-Stevens without undermining core policies that have made the Act so effective.

Magnuson-Stevens is passed due for reauthorization. But let us do so in a way that does not jeopardize the progress we have made, so we can keep building more sustainable and more profitable fisheries for today and for our nation's future.

I ask my colleagues to support the Huffman-Sablan amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOBIONDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, 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. 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY TO MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 336) to direct the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, to convey certain Federal property located in the State of Alaska to the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 336

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

SECTION 1. REAL PROPERTY CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and after completion of the survey and appraisal described in this section, the Administrator of General Services, on behalf of the Archivist of the United States, shall convey to the City by quitclaim deed for the consideration described in subsection (c), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property described in subsection (b).

(b) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of approximately 9 acres and improvements located at 400 East Fortieth Avenue in the City that is administered by the National Archives and Records Administration.

(2) SURVEY REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey, paid for by the City, that is satisfactory to the Archivist.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance of the property under subsection (a), the City shall pay to the Archivist an amount not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, to be determined as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The fair market value of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined based on an appraisal that—

(i) is conducted by a licensed, independent appraiser that is approved by the Archivist and the City;

(ii) is based on the highest and best use of the property;

(iii) is approved by the Archivist; and

(iv) is paid for by the City.

(2) PRECONVEYANCE ENTRY.—The Archivist, on terms and conditions the Archivist determines to be appropriate, may authorize the City to enter the property at no charge for preconstruction and construction activities.

(3) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Archivist may require additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Archivist considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) CITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “City” means the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 336.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 336 would direct the General Services Administration on behalf of the National Archives to convey property in Alaska to the city of Anchorage.

I am pleased to be the sponsor of this legislation, which will bring savings to the taxpayer. The National Archives has determined that it no longer needs the property to be conveyed in the bill and wants to sell it as part of its efforts to shrink its space footprint and reduce costs to the taxpayer.

The bill will require fair market value for the property based on an independent appraisal.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 336 which directs the General Services Administration, the GSA, on behalf of the Archivist of the U.S., to convey 9 acres of property in Anchorage, Alaska, to the local municipality in exchange for its fair market value.

The Archivist and GSA has reported this property as underutilized and that there is no need to keep this property in the Federal real estate inventory. This sale is consistent with the policy

supported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which has directed GSA to help other Federal agencies identify and dispose of unneeded property.

As a result, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 336.

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.

NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 944) to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 944

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

SECTION 1. COMPETITIVE AWARDS.

Section 320(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Using the amounts made available under subsection (i)(2)(B), the Administrator shall make competitive awards under this paragraph.

“(B) APPLICATION FOR AWARDS.—The Administrator shall solicit applications for awards under this paragraph from State, interstate, and regional water pollution control agencies and entities, State coastal zone management agencies, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals.

“(C) SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS.—In selecting award recipients under this paragraph, the Administrator shall select recipients that are best able to address urgent and challenging issues that threaten the ecological and economic well-being of coastal areas. Such issues shall include—

“(i) extensive seagrass habitat losses resulting in significant impacts on fisheries and water quality;

“(ii) recurring harmful algae blooms;

“(iii) unusual marine mammal mortalities;

“(iv) invasive exotic species that may threaten wastewater systems and cause other damage;

“(v) jellyfish proliferation limiting community access to water during peak tourism seasons;

“(vi) flooding that may be related to sea level rise or wetland degradation or loss; and

“(vii) low dissolved oxygen conditions in estuarine waters and related nutrient management.”

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$27,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for—

“(A) expenses relating to the administration of grants or awards by the Administrator under this section, including the award and oversight of grants and awards, except that such expenses may not exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated under this subsection for a fiscal year; and

“(B) making grants and awards under subsection (g).

“(2) ALLOCATIONS.—

“(A) CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not less than 80 percent of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used by the Administrator for the development, implementation, and monitoring of each of the conservation and management plans eligible for grant assistance under subsection (g)(2).

“(B) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—Not less than 15 percent of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used by the Administrator for making competitive awards described in subsection (g)(4).”

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

H.R. 944, introduced by my colleague, Representative LOBIONDO, reauthorizes the National Estuary Program found in section 320 of the Clean Water Act. Estuaries are unique and highly productive waters that are important to the ecological and economic basis of our Nation.

Congress first authorized the National Estuary Program in 1987, amendments to the Clean Water Act to promote the protection of the national significant estuaries in the United States that are deemed to be threatened by pollution, development, or overuse.

Unlike many of the programs under the Clean Water Act, the National Estuary Program is a nonregulatory program. Instead, it is designed to support collaborative, voluntary efforts of Federal, State, and local stakeholders to restore degraded estuaries.

Using consensus building in a collaborative decisionmaking process instead of a top-down regulatory approach, the National Estuary Program has been effective at promoting locally based involvement. In addition, it leverages non-Federal money for restoration activities by providing funding for the program.

In reauthorization of the National Estuary Program, H.R. 944 makes prudent fiscal adjustments. The bill reauthorizes section 320 of the Clean Water Act through 2018 in the amount of \$27 million a year. This amount is consistent with appropriations over the past 5 years, and, in recognition of the fiscal realities of today, decreases the authorized level of funding by \$8 million a year.

H.R. 944 also directs more funds to where they need to be in the individual estuaries in the program. The bill achieves this by reducing the amount

of discretionary funds made available to the EPA.

Finally, the bill allocates a portion of eligible program funds for competitive awards to Federal, State, and local stakeholders to address certain high priority estuary needs, including algae blooms, hypoxia, flooding, and invasive species. This is identical to a bill that passed the House by voice vote in the last Congress.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 944, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 944.

I am pleased the House is considering H.R. 944, a bill that I introduced along with Congressman LOBIONDO and Congressman MURPHY to reauthorize the National Estuary Program through 2020.

I want to thank my colleagues for their hard work in pulling this legislation together.

Estuaries are critically important to the health of our Nation's environment and our economy. Their waters are a unique mixture of freshwater, drainage from the land, and salty seawater. Estuaries provide vital nesting and feeding areas for many aquatic plants and animals. They also help maintain healthy ocean environments by filtering out sediment and pollutants from rivers and streams before they flow into the ocean.

In addition to improving habitat for critical wildlife like salmon, restoring estuaries can have important carbon sequestration effects.

For example, a report last year on the Snohomish Estuary in my district found that currently planned and in-progress restoration projects will result in at least 2.55 million tons of CO₂ sequestered from the atmosphere over the next 100 years. That is the equivalent of a year's worth of emissions from a half a million automobiles.

Over half of the U.S. population lives in coastal areas, including along the shores of estuaries. These areas provided 69 million jobs and contributed \$7.9 trillion to the economy recently. These gains come from commercial and recreational fishing, as well as tourism and other forms of regulation recreation. By one estimate, restoring our estuary areas could create more than 30 jobs for every \$1 million invested.

In the Pacific Northwest and across the country, healthy estuaries like the Puget Sound support fish, birds, and other wildlife, and sustain important economic and recreational activities like trade, fishing, tourism, and many other forms of outdoor recreation.

Estuaries in the Pacific Northwest also serve as habitat and spawning areas for salmon, another critical driver for our regional economy.

Unfortunately, human activities have led to a decline in the health of estuaries, threatening them in many

coastal parts of the country. Population growth in areas abutting estuaries have led to an increase in storm water runoff and sewage discharges, ultimately polluting the waters with toxins.

Fortunately, the National Estuary Program, which would be authorized by H.R. 944, is an important part of remedying these problems facing our Nation's estuaries. Since 1987, the program has operated successfully at the EPA in partnership with other State and local entities and has fostered innovative solutions to local water quality programs.

Funding from the program helps create solutions to nurture estuaries back to health, like the comprehensive plan we have for the Puget Sound recovery.

This bipartisan legislation that we have today will ensure that local organizations across the country, in partnership with the EPA, can protect and restore estuaries for the benefit of future generations.

I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank Chairman GIBBS and Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Members DeFazio and Napolitano for helping bring H.R. 944, the National Estuary Program Reauthorization, to the floor.

I would also like to thank my colleagues Mr. POSEY and Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and especially Mr. LARSEN, who has been great to work with on a number of issues.

This version of the National Estuary Program Reauthorization is fiscally responsible by reducing the authorization levels by \$8 million while ultimately increasing the amount of money each estuary program will receive. It is a very commonsense approach that helps get the job done.

This reauthorization will detail just how the EPA is to spend the authorized and appropriated money.

Unlike many of the programs under the Clean Water Act, the National Estuary Program is a nonregulatory program. That was mentioned before, but I think it bears repeating: it is a nonregulatory program.

Instead, it is designed to support collaborative, voluntary efforts of Federal, State, and local stakeholders to restore degraded estuaries. I think this is exactly the approach that will get results, and an approach that will encourage people to be working together for something that really can actually see a very positive result with our estuaries.

Unfortunately, the National Estuary Program has been losing money due to EPA administrative costs. By setting limits of 5 percent for administrative costs for the EPA, we can guarantee 80

percent of the funding goes to the end user, the NEP, and not bureaucratic salaries and red tape.

□ 1800

In this year's reauthorization, we have set aside 15 percent of the funding for a competitive award program. This program will seek applications meant to deal with urgent and challenging issues that threaten the ecological and economic well-being of coastal areas.

By structuring how the money is spent and lowering authorization levels, this legislation strikes the right balance of fiscal and environmental responsibility.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 944.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 944.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 944, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 944.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1335.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1831

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 further 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. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-128 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-128 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in House Report 114-128 offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 223, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

AYES—155

Adams	Costa	Heck (WA)
Aguiar	Courtney	Higgins
Ashford	Cummings	Himes
Bass	Davis (CA)	Honda
Beatty	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Bera	DeFazio	Huffman
Beyer	DeGette	Israel
Blumenauer	Delaney	Jeffries
Bonamici	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
F.	DeSaulnier	Keating
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Kennedy
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Kildee
Bustos	Duckworth	Kilmer
Butterfield	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Capps	Ellison	Kuster
Capuano	Engel	Langevin
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Esty	Larson (CT)
Carson (IN)	Farr	Lawrence
Cartwright	Fattah	Lee
Castro (TX)	Foster	Levin
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Ciçilline	Fudge	Loebsack
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Lowenthal
Clay	Garamendi	Lowe
Cleaver	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Cohen	Grayson	(NM)
Connolly	Grijalva	Lynch
Conyers	Hahn	Matsui
Cooper	Hastings	McCollum

McDermott	Rice (NY)
McGovern	Roybal-Allard
McNerney	Takano
Meeks	Ruppersberger
Moulton	Ryan (OH)
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Nadler	T.
Neal	Sarbanes
Norcross	Schakowsky
O'Rourke	Schiff
Pallone	Schrader
Pascarell	Scott (VA)
Payne	Scott, David
Pelosi	Serrano
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)
Peters	Sherman
Pingree	Sinema
Price (NC)	Sires
Quigley	Slaughter
Rangel	Smith (WA)

NOES—223

Abraham	Hanna
Allen	Hardy
Amash	Harper
Amodei	Harris
Babin	Hartzler
Barletta	Heck (NV)
Barr	Heck (VA)
Barton	Hensarling
Benishek	Hice, Jody B.
Bilirakis	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Hudson
Black	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)
Blum	Hultgren
Bost	Hunter
Boustany	Hurd (TX)
Brady (TX)	Hurt (VA)
Brat	Issa
Bridenstine	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Johnson, Sam
Buck	Jones
Bucshon	Jordan
Burgess	Joyce
Byrne	Katko
Calvert	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	King (NY)
Chabot	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Knight
Coffman	Labrador
Cole	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Lance
Comstock	Latta
Conaway	LoBiondo
Cook	Long
Costello (PA)	Loudermilk
Cramer	Love
Crenshaw	Lucas
Culberson	Luetkemeyer
Davis, Rodney	Lummis
Denham	MacArthur
Dent	Marchant
DeSantis	Marino
DesJarlais	Massie
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy
Donovan	McCaul
Duncan (SC)	McClintock
Duncan (TN)	McHenry
Emmer (MN)	McKinley
Fleischmann	McMorris
Fleming	Rodgers
Flores	McSally
Forbes	Meadows
Fortenberry	Meehan
Fox	Messer
Franks (AZ)	Mica
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Garrett	Miller (MI)
Gibbs	Moelenaar
Gibson	Mooney (WV)
Gohmert	Mullin
Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer
Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Graves (MO)	Nunes
Griffith	Olson
Grothman	Palazzo
Guinta	Palmer
Guthrie	Pearce
	Perry

Speier	Swalwell (CA)
Takano	Takano
Thompson (CA)	Titus
Titus	Tonko
Torres	Torres
Tsongas	Tsongas
Van Hollen	Vargas
Vargas	Veasey
Veasey	Vela
Vela	Velázquez
Velázquez	Visclosky
Walz	Walz
Wasserman	Wasserman
Schultz	Schultz
Watson Coleman	Watson Coleman
Welch	Welch
Yarmuth	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—54

Aderholt	Green, Al	Noem
Becerra	Green, Gene	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Nugent
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Pittenger
Crawford	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Crowley	Jolly	Poe (TX)
Cuellar	Kaptur	Polis
Curbelo (FL)	Kind	Richmond
Dold	Lewis	Roe (TN)
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Rush
F.	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Duffy	(NM)	Shimkus
Ellmers (NC)	Maloney,	Takai
Farenthold	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Fincher	Maloney, Sean	Waters, Maxine
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Gowdy	Moore	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Napolitano	Yoder

□ 1902

Messrs. LATTA, MCKINLEY, PEARCE, and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Monday, June 1st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 264. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Dingell Amendment to H.R. 1335—Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WITTMAN was allowed to speak out of order.)

SPORTSMEN'S TROPHY PRESENTATION

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, recently, the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus held its annual Member shoot-out, where Members get together from the Republican and Democrat sides and shoot a round of sporting clays, skeets, and trap. It is a friendly day where we get together and have some great competition. It is in the interest of the shooting sports and of our outdoor efforts there. And it was a great privilege to be there with the other Members.

We had a record turnout this year of Members from both sides of the aisle. We are blessed that Team Republican will retain the shoot-out trophy this year but by a narrow margin, with a winning score of 235-227.

It is a real honor for me to serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation. I have Congressman JEFF DUNCAN of South Carolina here, who is our co-vice chairman; and we also have Congressman TIM WALZ, who is our other co-chairman.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), the co-chair of our caucus.

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Congratulations to the gentleman and his team and to everyone who participated.

Congratulations to Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, who was the Republican top gun, and to MIKE THOMPSON of California, who was the overall top gun. Congratulations to them.

As the gentleman said, this is the largest bipartisan caucus in the Congress. The Congressional Sportsmen's

Foundation—the folks who are out there protecting our hunting, fishing, and outdoor heritage—thank you to all of them and to all the sponsors who made this possible.

It is great day for a great cause, and it shows that there are many things that bind us together.

So I congratulate the gentlemen, and we look forward to a friendly competition again next year.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment printed in House Report 114-128 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 149, noes 227, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

AYES—149

Adams	Esty	Meeks
Aguilar	Farr	Moulton
Bass	Fattah	Murphy (FL)
Beatty	Foster	Nadler
Bera	Frankel (FL)	Neal
Beyer	Fudge	Norcross
Blumenauer	Gabbard	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Gallego	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garamendi	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Graham	Payne
Brown (FL)	Grayson	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Peters
Bustos	Hahn	Pingree
Butterfield	Hastings	Price (NC)
Capps	Heck (WA)	Quigley
Capuano	Higgins	Rangel
Cardenas	Himes	Rice (NY)
Carney	Honda	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Ruiz
Cartwright	Huffman	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Israel	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Sánchez, Linda T.
Ciциlline	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Keating	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Clay	Kennedy	Schrader
Cleaver	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kilmer	Scott, David
Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Conyers	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Langevin	Sherman
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Lee	Speier
DeFazio	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Takano
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lofgren	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Tonko
Deutch	Lowe y	Torres
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Tsongas
Doggett	Lynch	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Matsui	Vargas
Edwards	McColum	Veasey
Ellison	McDermott	Vela
Engel	McGovern	Velázquez
Eshoo	McNerney	

Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman

NOES—227

Abraham	Guthrie
Allen	Hanna
Amash	Hardy
Amodei	Harper
Ashford	Harris
Babin	Hartzler
Babin	Heck (NV)
Barietta	Hensarling
Barr	Hice, Jody B.
Barton	Hill
Benish	Holding
Bilirakis	Hudson
Bishop (MI)	Huelskamp
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Hultgren
Blackburn	Hunter
Blum	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Hurt (VA)
Boustany	Hurt (VA)
Brady (TX)	Issa
Brat	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Jones
Buck	Jordan
Bucshon	Joyce
Burgess	Katko
Byrne	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	King (NY)
Carter (TX)	Kinzinger (IL)
Chabot	Kline
Chaffetz	Knight
Clawson (FL)	Labrador
Coffman	LaMalfa
Cole	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Lance
Collins (NY)	Latta
Comstock	LoBiondo
Conaway	Long
Cook	Loudermilk
Costa	Love
Costello (PA)	Lucas
Cramer	Luetkemeyer
Crenshaw	Lummis
Culberson	MacArthur
Davis, Rodney	Marchant
Denham	Marino
Dent	Massie
DeSantis	McCarthy
DesJarlais	McCaul
Diaz-Balart	McClintock
Donovan	McHenry
Duncan (SC)	McKinley
Duncan (TN)	McMorris
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers
Fleischmann	McSally
Fleming	Meadows
Flores	Meehan
Forbes	Messer
Fortenberry	Mica
Fox	Miller (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar
Ruiz	Mooney (WV)
Gibbs	Mullin
Gibson	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Gosar	Newhouse
Graves (GA)	Nunes
Graves (LA)	Olson
Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Griffith	Palmer
Grothman	Pearce
Guinta	Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—56

Aderholt	Fincher	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Becerra	Fitzpatrick	Maloney,
Bishop (GA)	Gowdy	Caroly n
Castor (FL)	Granger	Maloney, Sean
Clyburn	Green, Al	Meng
Crawford	Green, Gene	Moore
Crowley	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Cuellar	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Hinojosa	Nolan
Delaney	Jackson Lee	Nugent
Dold	Johnson (GA)	Jolly
Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Duffy	Kaptur	Pittenger
Ellmers (NC)	Kind	Pocan
Farenthold	Lewis	Poe (TX)
	Lipinski	Polis

Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta

Shimkus
Takai
Thompson (MS)
Waters, Maxine

Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Yoder

□ 1912

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Monday, June 1st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 265. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Lowenthal Amendment to H.R. 1335—Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the 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 (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, 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. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 274, 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 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.

□ 1915

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1335 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. . . PROTECTING FISHING COMMUNITIES FROM TOXIC POLLUTION.

In the aftermath of an oil or hazardous materials spill none of the amendments to fishery conservation requirements made by sections 4, 5, 7, 10, 13, and 15 of this Act shall

apply to any fishery impacted by such spill until—

(1) the relevant Regional Fishery Management Council has fully assessed the impacts of the spill to stocks of fish, fishing communities, and the marine environment;

(2) the polluter has paid for any cleanup or removal of pollution related to the spill in the marine environment that impacts a fishery, restored such fisheries to limit the long-term impact on stocks of fish, and provided compensation for the economic and job loss to the United States fishing industry and communities; and

(3) the polluter has paid for testing of fish to ensure that consumers are protected from toxins that have entered the food chain, and for testing of water quality to help fishermen avoid areas of pollution and find the safest areas to fish.

Mr. PETERS (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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. 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 will proceed immediately to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, preserving our beaches and bays and our coastal communities for future generations has to be a bipartisan endeavor. Congress passed landmark fisheries legislation in 1976 and reauthorized it in 1996 and 2006 with broad support from both parties.

Unfortunately, today's bill is a partisan one that will undermine our four-decade history of responsible and successful fisheries management. It creates loopholes and lessens transparency and accountability, which can only harm our coastal communities.

My amendment today is simple: give communities and regional experts at fishery management councils input, and increase the ability of local agencies to hold polluters more accountable after a spill.

Just a few weeks ago, on the California coast north of Santa Barbara, a pipeline ruptured beneath a coastal cliff, spilling 105,000 gallons of crude oil onto the beach and tidelands and into the Pacific Ocean. Despite rapid cleanup efforts from environmental officials and volunteers from across the State, the leak killed abundant marine life, including lobsters, seals, kelp bass, and local fish populations. It also forced the closure of local State beaches during the Memorial Day weekend, depriving local businesses of revenue from visitors coming to enjoy the scenic California coast.

Now, the short-term harm has been evident, but the long-term damage to the marine life, coastal ecosystems, and biodiversity, including fisheries and food stocks that are part of the region's economy, that damage won't be known for some time.

What is clear is that coastal communities deal with the harm from a spill

long after the initial cleanup ends, and they deserve greater oversight over those who caused the damage.

My amendment addresses this issue in three ways: first, it directs the regional fishery management council to conduct a full environmental assessment of the spill; second, it requires the responsible party to pay for any pollution cleanup and restoration of the harmed fishers, and to provide compensation for economic and job losses due to the spill; and third, it protects public safety and food quality by requiring that polluters pay for testing of toxins in fish and in local waters to help fishermen determine the safest areas for fishing.

These provisions are necessary because, as we have seen from past cleanups, the long-term direct and indirect environmental damage is not always immediately apparent, particularly on fish and wildlife populations and marine biodiversity. This is our experience.

For example, despite massive cleanup efforts following the infamous Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989, a 2007 study conducted by NOAA found that 26,000 gallons of oil from the Exxon Valdez were still trapped in the sand along the shoreline of Alaska. Those thousands of gallons of oil that remain decades later continue to damage fragile marine ecosystems and wildlife habitat and breeding grounds.

That 1989 spill caused more than \$300 million in economic harm to more than 32,000 Alaskans whose livelihoods depended on commercial fishing in that region. And in Santa Barbara, where last month's spill occurred, tourism, both on- and offshore, are central to the regional economy and will undoubtedly be harmed by this pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I represent San Diego, California, where the marine industry, the maritime industry, and our large natural harbor are key to the region's tourism economy which supports 158,000 local jobs and \$18.3 billion in economic impact. A spill like this could devastate our local economy and irreparably harm our delicate ecosystem.

It is imperative that Congress hold responsible parties accountable in the case of a destructive oil spill. We should all agree that supporting coastal communities and the businesses that depend on rivers, bays, lakes, beaches, and oceans deserve support and shouldn't be forced to pay for the mistakes of polluters.

Join me in supporting our local economies, protecting our coastal environments, ensuring public safety for consumers, and setting a higher standard for accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on the policy level, this stuff is already covered in the Oil Pollution Act, the Superfund covers it, and if you are really serious about doing this, lines 8 and 9 would be changed to "NOAA," as they are in the current statute. They have the expertise and the money to actually accomplish it.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I could say to all of you, with apologies to those who have been sending emails and dear colleagues around here, this amendment, you should simply throw it back. It is not a keeper. This is simply a fish story that is based on a big whopper. This amendment would actually take the bill, and it would gut it, clean it, and filet it. So, please, do not fall for this hook, line, and sinker.

I am not fishing for compliments here. But we have been floundering to find a solution for a long time, and that is why the underlying bill has a boatload of support for it.

I realize this is as good as it gets. I am okay, but those involved in the fishing community recognize that the status quo is not working as it was intended to work and needs to be fixed in some particular way. That is why, on the underlying bill, the commercial industry, the fishing industry, and the recreationists already are in support and have publicly said that. That is the first time all three groups have actually gotten together on this particular bill.

They realize there needs to be change in the status quo. They realize there needs to be transparency, which the underlying bill gives and is not there in the status quo. They realize that the science that has been used under the status quo is crappy and that this mandates multiple sources, better sources being used to make these final decisions.

So, just for the halibut—and I had one for "bass," but I have already censored it myself—vote "no" on the amendment and support the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERS. 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 5-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 155, nays 233, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—155

Adams Fattah Norcross
 Aguilar Foster O'Rourke
 Ashford Frankel (FL) Pallone
 Bass Fudge Pascrell
 Beatty Gabbard Payne
 Bera Gallego Pelosi
 Beyer Garamendi Perlmutter
 Blumenauer Graham Peters
 Bonamici Grayson Peterson
 Boyle, Brendan Grijalva Pingree
 F. Hahn Price (NC)
 Brady (PA) Hastings Quigley
 Brown (FL) Heck (WA) Rangel
 Brownley (CA) Higgins Rice (NY)
 Bustos Himes Roybal-Allard
 Butterfield Honda Ruiz
 Capps Hoyer Ruppertsberger
 Capuano Huffman Ryan (OH)
 Cárdenas Israel Sánchez, Linda
 Carney Jeffries T.
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Sarbanes
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Schakowsky
 Castro (TX) Keating Schiff
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL) Schrader
 Cicilline Kennedy Scott (VA)
 Clark (MA) Kildee Scott, David
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Serrano
 Clay Kirkpatrick Sewell (AL)
 Cleaver Kuster Sherman
 Cohen Langevin Sinema
 Connolly Larsen (WA) Sires
 Conyers Larson (CT) Slaughter
 Cooper Lawrence Smith (WA)
 Costa Lee Speier
 Courtney Levin Swalwell (CA)
 Cummings Lieu, Ted Takano
 Davis (CA) Loebsock Thompson (CA)
 Davis, Danny Lofgren Titus
 DeFazio Lowenthal Tonko
 DeGette Lowey Torres
 DeLauro Luján, Ben Ray Tsongas
 DelBene (NM) Van Hollen
 DeSaulnier Lynch Vargas
 Deutch Matsui Veasey
 Dingell McCollum Vela
 Doggett McDermott Velázquez
 Duckworth McGovern Visclosky
 Edwards McNeerney Walz
 Ellison Meeks Wasserman
 Engel Moulton Schultz
 Eshoo Murphy (FL) Watson Coleman
 Esty Nadler Welch
 Farr Neal Yarmuth

NAYS—223

Abraham Cramer Herrera Beutler
 Allen Crenshaw Hice, Jody B.
 Amash Culberson Hill
 Amodei Davis, Rodney Holding
 Babin Denham Hudson
 Barletta Dent Huelskamp
 Barr DeSantis Huizenga (MI)
 Barton DesJarlais Hultgren
 Benishek Diaz-Balart Hunter
 Billirakis Donovan Hurd (TX)
 Bishop (MI) Duncan (SC) Hurt (VA)
 Bishop (UT) Duncan (TN) Issa
 Black Emmer (MN) Jenkins (KS)
 Blackburn Fleischmann Jenkins (WV)
 Blum Fleming Johnson (OH)
 Bost Flores Johnson, Sam
 Boustany Forbes Jones
 Brady (TX) Fortenberry Jordan
 Brat Foyx Joyce
 Bridenstine Franks (AZ) Katko
 Brooks (AL) Frelinghuysen Kelly (PA)
 Brooks (IN) Garrett King (IA)
 Buchanan Gibbs King (NY)
 Buck Gibson Kinzinger (IL)
 Bucshon Gohmert Kline
 Burgess Goodlatte Knight
 Byrne Gosar Labrador
 Calvert Graves (GA) LaMalfa
 Carter (GA) Graves (LA) Lamborn
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO) Lance
 Chabot Griffith Latta
 Chaffetz Grothman LoBiondo
 Clawson (FL) Guinta Long
 Coffman Guthrie Loudermilk
 Cole Hanna Love
 Collins (GA) Hardy Lucas
 Collins (NY) Harper Luetkemeyer
 Comstock Harris Lummis
 Conaway Hartzler MacArthur
 Cook Heck (NV) Marchant
 Costello (PA) Hensarling Marino

Massie Reed Stewart
 McCarthy Reichert Stivers
 McCaul Renacci Stutzman
 McClintock Ribble Thompson (PA)
 McHenry Rice (SC) Thornberry
 McKinley Rigell Tiberi
 McMorris Roby Tipton
 Rodgers Rogers (AL) Trott
 McSally Rogers (KY) Turner
 Meadows Rohrabacher Upton
 Meehan Rokita Valadao
 Messer Rooney (FL) Wagner
 Mica Ros-Lehtinen Walberg
 Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Roskam
 Miller (MI) Ross Walden
 Moolenaar Rothfus Walker
 Mooney (WV) Rouzer Walorski
 Mullin Royce Walters, Mimi
 Mulvaney Russell Webster (TX)
 Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI) Webster (FL)
 Neugebauer Salmon Sanford
 Newhouse Nunes Scalise
 Olson Schweikert Scott, Austin
 Palazzo Green, Al Sensenbrenner
 Palmer Green, Gene Sessions
 Pearce Gutiérrez
 Perry Pittenger Shuster
 Pitts Hinojosa Simpson
 Poliquin Smith (MO) Smith (NE)
 Pompeo Smith (NE) Young (IA)
 Posey Smith (NJ) Young (IN)
 Price, Tom Smith (TX) Zeldin
 Ratcliffe Stefanik Zinke

NOT VOTING—54

Aderholt Granger Noem
 Becerra Green, Al Nolan
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Nugent
 Castor (FL) Gutiérrez Paulsen
 Clyburn Hinojosa Pittenger
 Crawford Jackson Lee Pocan
 Crowley Jolly Poe (TX)
 Cuellar Kaptur Polis
 Curbelo (FL) Kind Richmond
 Delaney Lewis Roe (TN)
 Dold Lipinski Rush
 Doyle, Michael Lujan Grisham Sanchez, Loretta
 F. (NM) Shimkus
 Duffy Maloney, Takai
 Ellmers (NC) Carolyn Thompson (MS)
 Farenthold Maloney, Sean Waters, Maxine
 Fincher Meng Wilson (FL)
 Fitzpatrick Moore Wilson (SC)
 Gowdy Napolitano Yoder

□ 1931

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 1st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 266. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 1335—Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 264, 265, 266, I was unavoidably detained by American Airlines on the tarmac at Ronald Reagan National Airport in Washington, D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on all three rollcall votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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 225, noes 152, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

AYES—225

Abraham Harper Perry
 Amash Harris Peterson
 Amodei Hartzler Pitts
 Babin Heck (NV) Poliquin
 Barletta Hensarling Pompeo
 Barr Herrera Beutler Posey
 Barton Hice, Jody B. Price, Tom
 Benishek Hill Ratcliffe
 Billirakis Holding Reed
 Bishop (MI) Hudson Reichert
 Bishop (UT) Huelskamp Renacci
 Black Huizenga (MI) Ribble
 Blackburn Hultgren Rice (SC)
 Blum Hunter
 Bost Hurd (TX) Rigell
 Boustany Hurt (VA) Roby
 Brady (TX) Issa Rogers (AL)
 Brat Jenkins (KS) Rogers (KY)
 Bridenstine Jenkins (WV) Rohrabacher
 Brooks (AL) Johnson (OH) Rokita
 Brooks (IN) Johnson, Sam Rooney (FL)
 Buchanan Jordan Ros-Lehtinen
 Buck Joyce Ross
 Bucshon Katko Rothfus
 Burgess Keating Rouzer
 Byrne Kelly (PA) Royce
 Calvert King (IA) Russell
 Carter (GA) King (NY) Ryan (WI)
 Carter (TX) Kinzinger (IL) Salmon
 Chabot Kline Sanford
 Chaffetz Knight Scalise
 Clawson (FL) Labrador Schweikert
 Coffman LaMalfa Scott, Austin
 Cole Lamborn Sensenbrenner
 Collins (GA) Lance Sessions
 Collins (NY) Latta Shuster
 Comstock LoBiondo Simpson
 Conaway Long Smith (MO)
 Cook Loudermilk Smith (NE)
 Costello (PA) Love Smith (NJ)
 Courtney Lucas Smith (TX)
 Cramer Luetkemeyer Stefanik
 Crenshaw Lummis Stewart
 Culberson Lynch Stivers
 Davis, Rodney MacArthur Stutzman
 Denham Marchant Thompson (PA)
 Dent Marino Thornberry
 DeSantis Massie Tiberi
 DesJarlais McCarthy Trott
 Diaz-Balart McCaul Turner
 Donovan McClintock Upton
 Duncan (SC) McHenry Valadao
 Duncan (TN) McKinley Wagner
 Emmer (MN) McMorris Walberg
 Fleischmann Rodgers Walden
 Fleming McSally Walker
 Flores Meadows Walorski
 Forbes Meehan Walters, Mimi
 Fortenberry Messer Webster (FL)
 Foyx Mica Wenstrup
 Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Westerman
 Frelinghuysen Miller (MI) Westmoreland
 Garrett Moolenaar Whitfield
 Gibbs Mooney (WV) Williams
 Gohmert Moulton Wittman
 Goodlatte Mullin Woodall
 Gosar Mulvaney Yoho
 Graves (GA) Murphy (PA) Young (AK)
 Graves (LA) Neugebauer Young (IA)
 Graves (MO) Newhouse Young (IN)
 Griffith Nunes Zeldin
 Grothman Olson Zinke
 Guinta Palazzo
 Guthrie Palmer
 Hardy Pearce

NOES—152

Cárdenas Davis, Danny
 Carney DeFazio
 Ashford Carson (IN) DeGette
 Bass Cartwright DeLauro
 Beatty Castro (TX) DelBene
 Bera Chu, Judy DeSaulnier
 Beyer Deutch
 Blumenauer Clark (MA) Dingell
 Bonamici Bonamici Clarke (NY) Doggett
 Boyle, Brendan Clay Duckworth
 F. Cleaver Edwards
 Brady (PA) Cohen Ellison
 Brown (FL) Connolly Engel
 Brownley (CA) Conyers Eshoo
 Bustos Cooper Esty
 Butterfield Costa Farr
 Capps Cummings Fattah
 Capuano Davis (CA) Foster

Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Sarbanes
Fudge	Loebsock	Schakowsky
Gabbard	Lofgren	Schiff
Gallego	Lowenthal	Schrader
Garamendi	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Gibson	Lujan, Ben Ray	Scott, David
Graham	(NM)	Serrano
Grayson	Matsui	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	McCollum	Sherman
Hahn	McDermott	Sinema
Hanna	McGovern	Sires
Hastings	McNerney	Slaughter
Heck (WA)	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Higgins	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Himes	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Honda	Neal	Takano
Hoyer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Huffman	O'Rourke	Titus
Israel	Pallone	Tonko
Jeffries	Pascrell	Torres
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Tsongas
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Vargas
Kennedy	Peters	Veasey
Kildee	Pingree	Vela
Kilmer	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Kirkpatrick	Quigley	Visclosky
Kuster	Rice (NY)	Walt
Langevin	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Larsen (WA)	Ruiz	Schultz
Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Lawrence	Ryan (OH)	Weber (TX)
Lee	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Levin	T.	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—55

Aderholt	Green, Al	Nugent
Becerra	Green, Gene	Paulsen
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pittenger
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Poe (TX)
Crawford	Jolly	Polis
Crowley	Kaptur	Rangel
Cuellar	Kind	Richmond
Curbelo (FL)	Lewis	Roe (TN)
Delaney	Lipinski	Rush
Dold	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Shimkus
F.	Maloney,	Takai
Duffy	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Ellmers (NC)	Maloney, Sean	Waters, Maxine
Farenthold	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fincher	Moore	Wilson (SC)
Fitzpatrick	Napolitano	Yoder
Gowdy	Noem	
Granger	Nolan	

□ 1941

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 267, I was unavoidably detained due to weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 267 on passage of the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act (H.R. 1335), I am not recorded because of prior commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 1st, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 267. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the final passage of H.R. 1335—Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: Dingell Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill; Lowenthal Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill; Democratic Motion to Re-commit H.R. 1335. Had I been present, I

would have voted "yes" on this bill; Final Passage of H.R. 1335. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1335, STRENGTHENING FISHING COMMUNITIES AND INCREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 1335, to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House, including in section 15 (page 35, beginning on line 10), striking "The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.);" and inserting "The Act".

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2578, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-135) on the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO COMMEMORATE THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 48, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STEFANK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 48

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO COMMEMORATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIETNAM WAR.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on July 8, 2015, for a ceremony to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1945

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2036

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman BROOKS from Alabama be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2036.

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

There was no objection.

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 on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

GIRLS COUNT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 802) to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 802

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 "Girls Count Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the United States Census Bureau's 2013 international figures, 1 person in 12, or close to 900,000,000 people, is a girl or young woman age 10 through 24.

(2) The Census Bureau's data also illustrates that young people are the fastest growing segment of the population in developing countries.

(3) Even though most countries do have birth registration laws, four out of ten babies born in 2012 were not registered worldwide. Moreover, an estimated 36 percent of children under the age of five worldwide (about 230,000,000 children) do not possess a birth certificate.

(4) A nationally recognized proof of birth system is important to determining a child's citizenship, nationality, place of birth, parentage, and age. Without such a system, a passport, driver's license, or other identification card is difficult to obtain. The lack of such documentation can prevent girls and women from officially participating in and benefitting from the formal economic, legal, and political sectors in their countries.

(5) The lack of birth registration among girls worldwide is particularly concerning as it can exacerbate the disproportionate vulnerability of women to trafficking, child marriage, and lack of access to health and education services.

(6) A lack of birth registration among women and girls can also aggravate what, in many places, amounts to an already reduced ability to seek employment, participate in civil society, or purchase or inherit land and other assets.

(7) Girls undertake much of the domestic labor needed for poor families to survive: carrying water, harvesting crops, tending livestock, caring for younger children, and doing chores.

(8) Accurate assessments of access to education, poverty levels, and overall census activities are hampered by the lack of official information on women and girls. Without this rudimentary information, assessments of foreign assistance and domestic social welfare programs are difficult to gauge.

(9) To help ensure that women and girls are considered in United States foreign assistance policies and programs, that their needs are addressed in the design, implementation, and evaluation of foreign assistance programs, and that women and girls have the opportunity to succeed, it is important that girls be counted and have access to birth certificates and other official documentation.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) encourage countries to support the rule of law and ensure girls and boys of all ages are able to fully participate in society, including by providing birth certifications and other official documentation;

(2) enhance training and capacity-building in key developing countries, local nongovernmental organizations, and other civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations representing children and families in the design, implementation, and monitoring of programs under this Act, to effectively address the needs of birth registries in countries where girls are systematically undercounted; and

(3) incorporate into the design, implementation, and evaluation of policies and programs measures to evaluate the impact that such policies and programs have on girls.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT COUNTING OF GIRLS IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to prioritize and advance ongoing efforts to—

(1) support programs that will contribute to improved and sustainable Civil Registra-

tion and Vital Statistics Systems (CRVS) with a focus on birth registration;

(2) support programs that build the capacity of developing countries' national and local legal and policy frameworks to prevent discrimination against girls in gaining access to birth certificates, particularly where this may help prevent exploitation, violence, and other abuse; and

(3) support programs and key ministries, including, interior, youth, and education ministries, to help increase property rights, social security, home ownership, land tenure security, inheritance rights, access to education, and economic and entrepreneurial opportunities, particularly for women and girls.

(b) **COORDINATION WITH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with the World Bank, relevant United Nations agencies and programs, and other relevant organizations to encourage and work with countries to enact, implement, and enforce laws that specifically collect data on girls and establish registration programs to ensure girls are appropriately counted and have the opportunity to be active participants in the social, legal, and political sectors of society in their countries.

(c) **COORDINATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.**—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to work with the United States, international, and local private sector and civil society organizations to advocate for the registration and documentation of all girls and boys in developing countries, in order to help prevent exploitation, violence, and other abuses and to help provide economic and social opportunities.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

The Secretary and the Administrator shall include in relevant evaluations and reports to Congress the following information:

(1) To the extent practicable, a breakdown of United States foreign assistance beneficiaries by age, gender, marital status, location, and school enrollment status.

(2) A description, as appropriate, of how United States foreign assistance benefits girls.

(3) Specific information, as appropriate, on programs that address the particular needs of girls.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

(2) **FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.**—The term “foreign assistance” has the meaning given the term in section 634(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394(b)).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. SUNSET.

This Act shall expire on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of S. 802, the Girls Count Act of 2015. It is identical to H.R. 2100, the House version of the bill, which my staff has worked on for 3 years now.

I want to thank Senator MARCO RUBIO and his staff for moving this bill through the Senate so we can soon get this important piece of legislation to the President's desk.

Madam Speaker, the Girls Count Act of 2015 is an important measure because what many people don't realize is that approximately 51 million children around the world are not registered at their births. That is one-third of all children under the age of 5 worldwide.

What does this mean? It means that these children lack a birth certificate, preventing them, oftentimes, from having access to fundamental rights which we here in the United States take for granted. It means they have no proof of their ages, parentage, or even of their citizenship. They are essentially non-people, oftentimes, in the eyes of the law.

For girls in particular, the lack of a birth registration certificate increases their vulnerability to trafficking and exploitation. These girls grow up facing high barriers to work, education, and political participation. Tragically, too often, these girls are treated in their own countries as if they really don't exist, as if they really don't count at all.

All of this is happening in places where we need women and girls to actively shape their countries' futures because, indeed, women serve as the backbone of stable, healthy societies all around the world. They are breadwinners and caregivers and peacemakers and the educators of the next generation.

For these reasons, I introduced and authored the Girls Count Act to direct the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development to support efforts aimed at improving birth registry-birth certificate programs in developing countries and others.

This step, which actually seems quite simple, will ensure that every child gets access to voting rights, land tenure rights, health services, and an education. Critically, Girls Count authorizes the State Department and USAID to support programs to protect girls' legal rights, particularly economic and property rights, and to build legal and policy frameworks to prevent discrimination against women and girls.

Your support of the Girls Count Act of 2015—those who have supported this legislation—will not only help to prevent human and sex trafficking in developing countries by aiding in identifying displaced persons and international adoption cases, but it will

give girls and women around the world access to the fundamental rights that they so rightly deserve.

I want to thank Congresswoman MCCOLLUM and Congressmen SMITH and SHERMAN for their support in introducing this legislation in the House, as well as to thank the 44 other bipartisan Members—this is a Republican and a Democratic bill—who have given their support.

I also want to thank my colleagues in the Senate, especially Senator MARCO RUBIO, for backing this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of S. 802, the Girls Count Act of 2015.

I want to thank Representatives CHABOT and MCCOLLUM for introducing the House companion to this bill.

Madam Speaker, around the world, over a third of children under the age of 5 have no registration of their births. Most of these children are girls.

I remember my grandmother—my mother's mother—who came to this country before World War I from Eastern Europe. She didn't have a certificate and didn't really know for sure what year she was born or what time she was born.

She knew it was December—she thought it was December—but she didn't have it, I remember. Here we are now, many, many years later, and we have the same problem in many areas around the world.

Not existing on paper can shatter a person's life. With official documentation comes certain protections, and without those protections a person becomes an easy target for child labor, human trafficking, and child marriage. Down the line, many of these children will be unable to inherit land or money, to start a business, or even to open a bank account.

This sort of marginalization often hits women the hardest. Unregistered women are more likely to be confined to their homes and to be invisible to the outside world. They enjoy only limited choices and opportunities, and their marginalization drags down the prosperity of their communities.

Birth registration has most recently become an acute problem in Syria. The ongoing civil war has caused countless internally displaced and refugee children to go unregistered. As a result, these children face a high risk of entering into early or illegal marriages, of being sex trafficked, of being forced into child labor, or of being recruited by terrorist groups.

S. 802 will ramp up efforts to get more children registered around the world. It authorizes the State Department and USAID to work with local governments to ensure equal access to registration programs. It uses existing funding to more effectively address this increasingly serious problem.

This bill would complement the work of organizations around the world en-

gaged in the important work of protecting vulnerable children, and it would put pressure on other governments to act.

While improving birth registration systems helps the most vulnerable populations, it has positive ripple effects across a society. Governments with better records can provide better services, tailor more effective policies, and bring more people into full participation in their economies. This basic practice can help make entire countries stronger.

Getting children registered at birth helps get them off to a good start, and this bill will help make that happen. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is now my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), one of the co-authors of this bill and someone who has worked endlessly to make sure this bill passes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to support the Girls Count Act.

I want to thank Mr. CHABOT and his staff for working alongside my office on this important bill. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and, of course, Mr. ENGEL for their support in moving this bill forward.

Madam Speaker, we can all agree that every child deserves to have his birth, name, and identity recognized by his government. Every child deserves access to an education and to health services. Without a recognized identity, that is just not possible. Unfortunately, UNICEF estimates that 230 million children under the age of 5—and that is mostly girls—do not have birth certificates.

Without this piece of paper, they are effectively invisible to their governments, invisible to the world. These invisible girls are likely not to be able to attend school or to access the needed health services. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for a girl to inherit, to vote, or to simply be a full and active member of her community.

This girl would be at high risk of being confined to her home, of being forced into early marriage, or of being sold into human trafficking. Without a birth certificate, she will likely face a bleak future. None of us would want this for her.

The Girls Count Act is exactly what the title says; it helps ensure that all girls and boys are counted by their governments. The bill helps support the efforts of the Secretary of State and the Administrator of USAID to work with international organizations and NGOs to improve birth registration for all children. Every child deserves to have his birth recognized, and it deserves to be recognized by his government.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and my right to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Once again, let me say that getting children registered at birth helps get them off to a good start. This bill encourages governments to enact laws and policies that give all children, including girls, a chance at being full participants in society. I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I want to again compliment Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. CHABOT for their hard work on this very important piece of legislation. This should be a unanimous "yes." I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to thank Congresswoman MCCOLLUM and also the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for their leadership on this issue. Both of them have been very important parts of seeing this through the House. It went through the other body recently as well, so it is working its way to the President's desk, and we are very encouraged by that.

Madam Speaker, many of us are deeply concerned by the appalling acts of injustice that are committed against women and girls around the world on a daily basis. The headlines are, oftentimes, hard to believe—acid attacks in Iran, death at the hands of a savage mob in Afghanistan, the kidnapping of schoolgirls in Nigeria—yet the disenfranchisement of women and girls around the world is not just an humanitarian issue; it is a development issue, and it is a security issue as well.

How can a nation thrive when half of its citizens are oftentimes denied their most basic human rights? The Girls Count Act—this act, the one that we are talking about this evening—recognizes the suffering and aims to empower those who have been cast into the shadows of their societies.

Birth registration is one of the first steps in the fight to preserve an individual's basic rights under the law in that particular country. It is also a critical means to ensuring the full participation of women and girls in their communities. Whether it is voting or owning property or employment or health care or a whole range of things. Let's help girls count.

Again, I want to thank the House for supporting the passage of this measure. This will be the second year now—2 years in a row—that this House, I believe, will support it, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, as we pass the bipartisan Girls Count Act of 2015, I'd like to emphasize the importance of advancing women's rights around the world. In 2015, it is completely unacceptable that women still do not possess the same rights as men.

My grandmother raised her family and put food on the table to ensure that her children and grandchildren received the education and care they deserved. I am incredibly proud of my grandmother and all women like her who are the rocks of their families. I am fighting for women's rights because it is each generation's obligation to ensure that the next generation is better off than the previous. I fight for my daughter and granddaughter, who I hope will one day live in a world where there is true gender equality.

In a time where women should be equal to men, there are unspeakable atrocities being committed all over the world. For example, Boko Haram kidnapped over 300 school girls, drawing the ire of global activists. By passing this legislation, we will become leaders in the worldwide fight against misogyny. This bill requires countries around the world to develop civil registration and statistical programs to better trace women's information. In addition, it prevents governments from discriminating against women, while creating a policy framework to improve access to economic and property ownership. I sincerely hope that governments draft strong legislation that changes the current policy.

I am grateful that our chamber has taken this important step to ensure that countries around the world recognize the need to improve women's access to basic rights. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting women's rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my good friend and colleague Congressman STEVE CHABOT for his leadership and hard work in shepherding the Girls Count Act as it makes its way to the President's desk. It is important legislation that will make an impact in the lives of so many girls and young women around the world.

Like last year, I am an original co-sponsor of the House version of the Girls Count Act, and I think that the version introduced in both Houses this Congress is even better than the one that the House passed last year, as it explicitly recognizes the great work that so many faith-based organizations do around the globe.

There is a need for the legislation, because in too many parts of the world, girls are discriminated against simply for being a girl. Indeed, this disregard for the value of the girl child often begins in the womb, in countries such as India and China, where we see the horrific practice of sex-selective abortion. This cruel practice in turn has led to a gender imbalance which has fed other crimes against women, such as sex trafficking, bride selling and prostitution.

I chaired a hearing two years ago on the problem of "India's Missing Girls," which addressed the problem of violence against the girl child in India. Sex-selective abortion and female infanticide have led to lopsided sex ratios: in parts of India, for example, 126 boys are born for every 100 girls. Perhaps the best figures we have concerning the magnitude of the problem come from India's 2011 census figures, which find that there are approximately 37 million more men than women in India.

In China, too, we see the brutal effects of a one-child policy that causes baby girls to be killed before birth; where only one child per couple is permitted in a society that has a traditional preference for sons, the predictable re-

sult is that a disproportionate number of girls will be killed in the womb.

As Mara Hvistendahl recounted in a book I recommend to all of my colleagues, *Unnatural Selection: Choosing Boys Over Girls, and the Consequences of a World Full of Men*, in Asia alone, there are 160 million missing girls, roughly the same amount of women and girls as there are in the United States. The result of this sex-imbalance is a world where there is greater political instability, with violence inside the womb begetting violence outside as well.

Today's legislation, which seeks to have every girl counted and registered, marks a small but important step toward a world where every child, boy or girl, is equally valued and cherished for her or his inherent, God-given dignity from the moment of conception.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 802.

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.

PROTECT AND PRESERVE INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY ACT

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1493) to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1493

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 "Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(2) **CULTURAL PROPERTY.**—The term "cultural property" includes property covered under—

(A) the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, concluded at The Hague on May 14, 1954 (Treaty Doc. 106-1(A));

(B) Article 1 of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World's Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO on November 23, 1972 (commonly referred to as the "1972 Convention"); or

(C) Article 1 of the Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted by UNESCO on November 14, 1970 (commonly referred to as the "1970 UNESCO Convention").

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Over the years, international cultural property has been looted, trafficked, lost, damaged, or destroyed due to political instability, armed conflict, natural disasters, and other threats.

(2) During China's Cultural Revolution, many antiques were destroyed, including a large portion of old Beijing, and Chinese authorities are now attempting to rebuild portions of China's lost architectural heritage.

(3) In 1975, the Khmer Rouge, after seizing power in Cambodia, systematically destroyed mosques and nearly every Catholic church in the country, along with many Buddhist temples, statues, and Buddhist literature.

(4) In 2001, the Taliban destroyed the Bamiyan Buddhas, ancient statues carved into a cliffside in central Afghanistan, leading to worldwide condemnation.

(5) After the fall of Saddam Hussein, thieves looted the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, resulting in the loss of approximately 15,000 items, including ancient amulets, sculptures, ivories, and cylinder seals. Many of these items remain unrecovered.

(6) The 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami not only affected 11 countries, causing massive loss of life, but also damaged or destroyed libraries, archives, and World Heritage Sites such as the Mahabalipuram in India, the Sun Temple of Koranak on the Bay of Bengal, and the Old Town of Galle and its fortifications in Sri Lanka.

(7) In Haiti, the 2010 earthquake destroyed art, artifacts, and archives, and partially destroyed the 17th century Haitian city of Jacmel.

(8) In Mali, the Al-Qaeda affiliated terrorist group Ansar Dine destroyed tombs and shrines in the ancient city of Timbuktu—a major center for trade, scholarship, and Islam in the 15th and 16th centuries—and threatened collections of ancient manuscripts.

(9) In Egypt, recent political instability has led to the ransacking of museums, resulting in the destruction of countless ancient artifacts that will forever leave gaps in humanity's record of the ancient Egyptian civilization.

(10) In Syria, the ongoing civil war has resulted in the shelling of medieval cities, damage to five World Heritage Sites, and the looting of museums containing artifacts that date back more than six millennia and include some of the earliest examples of writing.

(11) In Iraq and Syria, the militant group ISIL has destroyed numerous cultural sites and artifacts, such as the Tomb of Jonah in July 2014, in an effort to eradicate ethnic and religious minorities from contested territories. Concurrently, cultural antiquities that escape demolition are looted and trafficked to help fund ISIL's militant operations.

(12) On February 12, 2015, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 2199 (2015), which "[r]eaffirms its decision in paragraph 7 of resolution 1483 (2003) and decides that all Member States shall take appropriate steps to prevent the trade in Iraqi and Syrian cultural property and other items of archaeological, historical, cultural, rare scientific, and religious importance illegally removed from Iraq since 6 August 1990 and from Syria since 15 March 2011, including by prohibiting cross-border trade in such items, thereby allowing for their eventual safe return to the Iraqi and Syrian people."

(13) United Nations Security Council resolution 2199 (2015) also warns that ISIL and

other extremist groups are trafficking cultural heritage items from Iraq and Syria to fund their recruitment efforts and carry out terrorist attacks.

(14) The destruction of cultural property represents an irreparable loss of humanity's common cultural heritage and is therefore a loss for all Americans.

(15) Protecting international cultural property is a vital part of United States cultural diplomacy, showing the respect of the United States for other cultures and the common heritage of humanity.

(16) The United States Armed Forces have played important roles in preserving and protecting cultural property. In 1943, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established a commission to advise the United States military on the protection of cultural property. The commission formed teams of individuals known as the "Monuments Men" who are credited with securing, cataloguing, and returning hundreds of thousands of works of art stolen by the Nazis during World War II.

(17) The Department of State, in response to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, noted that "the legislation is important to our foreign relations, including our international cultural relations. The expanding worldwide trade in objects of archaeological and ethnological interest has led to wholesale depredations in some countries, resulting in the mutilation of ceremonial centers and archaeological complexes of ancient civilizations and the removal of stone sculptures and reliefs." The Department further noted that "[t]he United States considers that on grounds of principle, good foreign relations, and concern for the preservation of the cultural heritage of mankind, it should render assistance in these situations."

(18) The U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield was founded in 2006 to support the implementation of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and to coordinate with the United States military, other branches of the United States Government, and other cultural heritage nongovernmental organizations in preserving international cultural property threatened by political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) protect and preserve international cultural property at risk of looting, trafficking, and destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters;

(2) protect international cultural property pursuant to its obligations under international treaties to which the United States is a party;

(3) prevent, in accordance with existing laws, importation of cultural property pillaged, looted, stolen, or trafficked at all times, including during political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters; and

(4) ensure that existing laws and regulations, including import restrictions imposed through the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury, are fully implemented to prevent trafficking in stolen or looted cultural property.

SEC. 4. UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY PROTECTION.

The Secretary of State shall designate a Department of State employee at the Assistant Secretary level or above to serve concurrently as the United States Coordinator for International Cultural Property Protection. The Coordinator shall—

(1) coordinate and promote efforts to protect international cultural property, especially activities that involve multiple Federal agencies;

(2) act as Chair of the Coordinating Committee on International Cultural Property Protection established under section 5;

(3) resolve interagency differences;

(4) develop strategies to reduce illegal trade and trafficking in international cultural property in the United States and abroad, including by reducing consumer demand for such trade;

(5) support activities to assist countries that are the principle sources of trafficked cultural property to protect cultural heritage sites and to prevent cultural property looting and theft;

(6) work with and consult domestic and international actors such as foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations, nongovernmental organizations, museums, educational institutions, and research institutions to protect international cultural property; and

(7) submit to the appropriate congressional committees the annual report required under section 6.

SEC. 5. COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Coordinating Committee on International Cultural Property Protection (in this section referred to as the "Committee").

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The full Committee shall meet not less often than annually to coordinate and inform Federal efforts to protect international cultural property and to facilitate the work of the United States Coordinator for International Cultural Property Protection designated under section 4.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the United States Coordinator for International Cultural Property Protection, who shall act as Chair, and representatives of the following:

(1) The Department of State.

(2) The Department of Defense.

(3) The Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(4) The Department of the Interior.

(5) The Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(6) The United States Agency for International Development.

(7) The Smithsonian Institution.

(8) Such other entities as the Chair determines appropriate.

(d) SUBCOMMITTEES.—The Committee may include such subcommittees and taskforces as the Chair determines appropriate. Such subcommittees or taskforces may be comprised of a subset of the Committee members or of such other members as the Chair determines appropriate. At the discretion of the Chair, the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) and section 552b of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to open meetings) shall not apply to activities of such subcommittees or taskforces.

(e) CONSULTATION.—The Committee shall consult with governmental and nongovernmental organizations, including the U.S. Committee of the Blue Shield, museums, educational institutions, and research institutions on efforts to promote and protect international cultural property.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES TO PROTECT INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the next six years, the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Coordinator for International Cultural Property Protection, and in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Develop-

ment, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, as appropriate, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes information on activities of—

(1) the United States Coordinator and the Coordinating Committee on International Cultural Property Protection to protect international cultural property;

(2) the Department of State to protect international cultural property, including activities undertaken pursuant to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, and other statutes, international agreements, and policies, including—

(A) procedures the Department has instituted to protect international cultural property at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters; and

(B) actions the Department has taken to protect international cultural property in conflicts to which the United States is a party;

(3) the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to protect international cultural property, including activities and coordination with other Federal agencies, international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations regarding the protection of international cultural property at risk due to political unrest, armed conflict, natural or other disasters, and USAID development programs;

(4) the Department of Defense to protect international cultural property, including activities undertaken pursuant to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and other cultural property protection statutes and international agreements, including—

(A) directives, policies, and regulations the Department has instituted to protect international cultural property at risk of destruction due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters; and

(B) actions the Department has taken to avoid damage to cultural property through construction activities abroad; and

(5) the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to protect both international cultural property abroad and international cultural property located in, or attempted to be imported into, the United States, including activities undertaken pursuant to statutes and international agreements, including—

(A) statutes and regulations the Department has employed in criminal, civil, and civil forfeiture actions to prevent and interdict trafficking in stolen and smuggled cultural property, including investigations into transnational organized crime and smuggling networks; and

(B) actions the Department has taken in order to ensure the consistent and effective application of law in cases relating to both international cultural property abroad and international cultural property located in, or attempted to be imported into, the United States.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES TO ENGAGE IN INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTY PROTECTION ACTIVITIES WITH THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any agency that is involved in international cultural property protection activities is authorized to enter into agreements or memoranda of understanding with the Smithsonian Institution to temporarily engage personnel from the Smithsonian Institution for the purposes of furthering such

international cultural property protection activities.

SEC. 8. EMERGENCY PROTECTION FOR SYRIAN CULTURAL PROPERTY.

(a) **PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 304 of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2603) (relating to a Presidential determination that an emergency condition applies with respect to any archaeological or ethnological material of any State Party to the Convention), the President shall apply the import restrictions referred to in such section 304 with respect to any archaeological or ethnological material of Syria, except that subsection (c) of such section 304 shall not apply. Such import restrictions shall take effect not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **ANNUAL DETERMINATION REGARDING CERTIFICATION.**—

(1) **DETERMINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall, not less often than annually, determine whether at least one of the conditions specified in subparagraph (B) is met, and shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such determination.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—The conditions referred to in subparagraph (A) are the following:

(i) The Government of Syria is incapable, at the time a determination under such subparagraph is made, of fulfilling the requirements to request an agreement under section 303 of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2602).

(ii) It would be against the United States national interest to enter into such an agreement.

(2) **TERMINATION OF RESTRICTIONS.**—The import restrictions referred to in subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is five years after the date on which the President determines that neither of the conditions specified in paragraph (1)(B) are met, unless before such termination date Syria requests to enter into an agreement with the United States pursuant to section 303 of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, in which case such import restrictions may remain in effect until the earliest of either—

(A) the date that is three years after the date on which Syria makes such a request; or

(B) the date on which the United States and Syria enter into such an agreement.

(c) **WAIVER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may waive the import restrictions referred to in subsection (a) for specified cultural property if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the conditions described in paragraph (2) are met.

(2) **CONDITIONS.**—The conditions referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) The foreign owner or custodian of the specified cultural property has requested such property be temporarily located in the United States for protection purposes.

(B) Such property shall be returned to the foreign owner or custodian when requested by such foreign owner or custodian.

(C) Granting a waiver under this subsection will not contribute to illegal trafficking in cultural property or financing of criminal or terrorist activities.

(3) **ACTION.**—If the President grants a waiver under this subsection, the specified cultural property that is the subject of such waiver shall be placed in the temporary custody of the United States Government or in the temporary custody of a cultural or educational institution within the United States for the purpose of protection, restoration, conservation, study, or exhibition, without profit.

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall prevent application of the Act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes (22 U.S.C. 2459; Public Law 89-259) with respect to archaeological or ethnological material of Syria.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “archaeological or ethnological material of Syria” means cultural property of Syria and other items of archaeological, historical, cultural, rare scientific, or religious importance unlawfully removed from Syria on or after March 15, 2011; and

(2) the term “State Party” has the meaning given such term in section 302 of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. **CHABOT**) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. **ENGEL**) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. **CHABOT**. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. **CHABOT**. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I submit for the **RECORD** letters between the committees of jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, the history of civilization is under attack. The Islamic State, also known as ISIS, continues to wreak havoc throughout Iraq and Syria, laying a path of death and destruction in order to establish and expand its caliphate.

□ 2000

No offense is more appalling than the terrorists' complete disregard for human life. ISIS has unleashed a campaign of sickening violence against Shi'a Muslims and fellow Sunnis who do not share their radical beliefs, as well as against vulnerable religious and ethnic minorities. This includes its public beheadings and executions and the selling of women and girls into sexual slavery.

Besides the human toll of ISIS' deplorable acts, we also mourn the loss of society's cultural heritage, as the extremists loot and destroy their way through ancient sites in the territories they conquer. We have seen heart-breaking footage of ISIS drilling their way through priceless artifacts in Mosul and bulldozing magnificent Mesopotamian ruins in the 3000-year-old city of Nimrud. ISIS claims the annihilation of cultural sites is meant to counter idolatry, but clearly these terrorists have another goal: to remove all traces of the region's rich and diverse religious and cultural past. By eliminating all evidence of humanity's common heritage, they are paving the

way for their own horrifying brand of Islamist extremism.

What we are witnessing is a cultural genocide. For ISIS, however, this looting of antiquities is big business. Some reports indicate that they are earning as much as \$100 million annually from the sale of stolen artifacts, which they often sell to middlemen who can peddle these treasures in old-fashioned markets or online.

Earlier this year, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution that urged member states to take steps to prevent the trafficking of Iraqi and Syrian cultural properties, and just last week, all 193 U.N. members agreed to step up the prosecution of those engaged in this illegal trade.

I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs' ranking member, Elliott Engel, for introducing this bipartisan bill that we have before us this evening and for his continued leadership on this critical issue. This bill, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, will help the U.S. do its part to counter the smuggling and sale of stolen Syrian antiquities.

Specifically, the bill will improve coordination of U.S. efforts to protect cultural property and prevent these artifacts from being removed since the start of Syria's civil war from being sold or imported into this country, into the United States. It is important to note that the legislation's emergency import restrictions are not designed to continue into perpetuity and can be waived under certain conditions for the temporary safekeeping of cultural property within the United States.

I also want to make clear that this bill only restricts the import of certain Syrian antiquities that have been removed from that country during the current conflict. Nothing in this legislation is meant to interfere with the legal sale of antiquities that do not fall under this category nor with other aspects of the import process.

I want to again thank **ELLIOTT ENGEL**, the ranking member of our committee, for his work on this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 29, 2015.

Hon. **EDWARD R. ROYCE**,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 1493, the “Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act.” As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1493 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I agree to waive consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that by forgoing consideration of H.R. 1493 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward

so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 29, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1493 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, June 1, 2015.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 1493, the "Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act." The bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

I recognize and appreciate the desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Homeland Security will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill by seeking a sequential referral. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1493 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation.

This waiver is also given with the understanding that the Committee on Homeland Security expressly reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provision within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or any similar legislation, and requests your support for such a request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1493, and ask that a copy of this

letter and your response be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 1, 2015.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, House Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request of that bill to the Committee on Homeland Security.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1493 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 1, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter concerning H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, as amended. I am writing to confirm that, although there are certain provisions in the bill that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, the committee will forgo action on this bill in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration.

I am glad we agree that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee on Armed Services with respect to any future jurisdictional claim over the provisions contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your support for the appointment of committee members to any House-Senate conference convened to consider such provisions.

Thank you for agreeing to place a copy of your letter acknowledging our jurisdictional interest, along with this response, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the measure on the House floor. I look forward to continuing to work together as this legislation moves toward final passage.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 29, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, 2216 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve

International Cultural Property Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1493 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 1, 2015.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 2170 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE, I am writing with respect to H.R. 1493, the "Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1493 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1493 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1493, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 1493.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 29, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, 2138 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 1493, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support

your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 1493 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 1493, as amended, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we have worked very, very hard on this bill. This is a very, very important bill. So let me first thank Chairman ED ROYCE for his efforts to move this bill forward. He is a good partner on the committee, and we couldn't have gone this far without him. I also want to thank the lead co-sponsors, Representative CHRIS SMITH and Representative BILL KEATING, who have been champions on this issue. I want to thank Mr. CHABOT for his support and his eloquence in speaking for the bill.

One of the things that we do on the Committee on Foreign Affairs is, whenever possible, we work in a bipartisan fashion, and this is a perfect example of working together in a bipartisan fashion for something that is really just so important.

Madam Speaker, by now we have all seen footage of ISIS extremists taking sledgehammers, as Mr. CHABOT mentioned, to ancient, irreplaceable artifacts across the territory they control. Now, these are not random acts of vandalism. We are witnessing a deliberate campaign to attempt to rewrite world history. From the tomb of Jonah in Mosul to Yazidi shrines in Sinjar, ISIS is leveling sites that preserve a record of the region's rich and diverse past. I think Mr. CHABOT put it very well when he said the same thing.

We have seen this tactic before. In Afghanistan, the Taliban wiped out the Bamiyan Buddhas in March of 2000. Who can forget that? During the Holocaust, the Nazis systematically targeted Jewish property as part of their effort to wipe out an entire race.

Now, some people will say why are we talking about the destruction of ancient ruins while so many people are suffering and dying at the hands of ISIS? That is not important. Of course, we need to stay focused on stopping the violence and alleviating the dire humanitarian situation festering across the region, but the reality is that we cannot separate these issues so easily. After all, before ISIS reduces these sites to rubble, the group loots everything they can carry, traffics the artifacts on the black market, and uses those resources to fund their violent rampage.

So it is directly connected to the murder and killing of so many civilians and their brutality. They use these artifacts to get money so that they can

keep their war machine going, so that they can keep their killings going, so that they can keep their brutality going. So the two are connected.

ISIS has ransacked thousands of artifacts from dozens of World Heritage Sites, places like cities of Mari and Dura Europos, which were virtually untouched before this crisis. These places are now lost to history, and their destruction has funneled, as I said before, millions of dollars into ISIS' coffers.

We need to cut off the source of funding and at the same time work to preserve this imperiled cultural history. There is already a good effort underway, a global effort underway.

In February, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution calling on governments to prohibit trade of cultural property looted from Syria and Iraq. The Security Council found that this step would reduce ISIS' operational capability to organize and carry out terrorist attacks. Our Western allies have cracked down on traffickers trying to sell looted artifacts from Iraq and Syria. Now is the time for the United States to do more, and that is precisely what this bill does.

First of all, this bill takes steps to ensure the antiquities trafficking that is lining ISIS' pockets is not taking place within our borders. This legislation would impose tough, new import restrictions on cultural artifacts removed from Syria similar to restrictions we passed in 2004 with respect to Iraq. So we are doing the same thing that we did in Iraq in 2004 with Syria, trying to prevent these looted artifacts from funding the terrorist machine.

Nothing in this legislation would interfere with the legal sale or exhibition of antiquities that were not smuggled out of Syria during the current crisis, and there are exceptions to allow artifacts to come here for protection and restoration. These new rules would remain in effect until the crisis in Syria is resolved and America is able to work with a new Syrian Government to protect cultural property from trafficking under a bilateral agreement in accordance with America's national interests.

Secondly, this bill enhances collaboration among government agencies already working on this problem. This bill would bring together programs, from the Smithsonian, to the Pentagon, to Homeland Security, through a new interagency body with a single coordinator. It would improve congressional oversight to make sure we are efficient in the way we are addressing this challenge. These steps will not replace the authorities of existing bodies but will help ensure their programs work together effectively.

This bill represents the newest chapter in a long tradition. Since World War II, America has led the world in protecting historical property from those bent on its destruction. That leadership is needed today. We must act swiftly to confront this threat, to cut off a critical source of ISIS fund-

ing, to stand up to this barbaric brand of psychological warfare, and to stop those determined to rewrite history. I urge all colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank Mr. CHABOT again.

Madam Speaker, let me close by noting that with each passing day, ISIS is selling looted artifacts to the highest bidder, further financing death and destruction. Whatever is left behind, they reduce to rubble, leveling religious sites, digging up ancient cities, and erasing the last traces of long lost civilizations whose histories have remained in soil and sand for thousands of years, and these people destroy that.

We must stand up to these acts. We must do more to cut off ISIS' funding and save cultural property. That is why it is so important. To help achieve this effort, we need to pass H.R. 1493. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I would first ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 944.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, the whole world continues to recoil in horror at ISIS' depravity. The ancient cities that face destruction at its hands are considered the birthplace of modern civilization. Just weeks ago, ISIS conquered the ancient city of Palmyra, the so-called jewel of the desert. Recent reports that ISIS has not destroyed these sites may give some of us hope, but judging from their prior barbaric acts, it is probably just a matter of time before they do the same thing there as they have done so horrifically in other places.

The legislation before us today—and I again want to thank Mr. ENGEL for introducing the legislation—and oversight of the U.S. agencies responsible for recognizing and protecting cultural property, ensuring that such treasures are protected to the best of our ability, that is what this legislation would do.

I appreciate the other committees of jurisdiction for working with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this measure, particularly the Committee on Ways and Means for its assistance on the critical import restrictions on this bill.

As Mr. ENGEL mentioned, when one is looking at this, we are looking at cultural things which have been—let's face it—destroyed forever. Some of these things are thousands of years old, and you can't bring them back. And you can't help but think—we are talking about physical things here, but we have also seen them do other horrific things.

When they take a Jordanian pilot and in a particularly barbaric fashion essentially set him on fire in a cage, when they take people out to a beach and one by one behead them, when they sell innocent women and young girls into slavery, over and over again, we have seen these horrific things happening, and it is time the world stood up to this group, both for the horrific things they are doing on historic artifacts which can't be brought back, but also the human lives that they have so callously extinguished. This group must be stopped. Let's hope that this evening we are at least taking a step in that direction.

I again thank Mr. ENGEL, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, as we vote on H.R. 1493 in the House today, I would like to share with you the series of unfortunate and barbaric events that have plagued The Cultural Museum of Mosul and robbed the people of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan of their historical lineage.

No stranger to war and tribal conflict, the people of Mosul, Iraq have suffered persecution and displacement under the Ottoman Empire, British colonial rule, and various tyrannical regimes. Despite all these hardships, Mosul was once a city of commercial importance to the region. Commerce and trade brought a rich exchange of history and culture to Mosul, which was preserved in the Museum of Mosul.

The museum provided a connection to a national identity and pride, which was once flourishing and prosperous. They say it is important to know your past so that you can learn from the mistakes of previous generations and better prepare for the future that is ahead. The people of Mosul were robbed of that opportunity in April of this year by ISIS. Just days before the reopening of the museum, which was looted during the Iraq War in 2003, ISIS released a horrific video showing militants using sledgehammers to demolish stone sculptures and other centuries-old artifacts.

The world watched in horror and disbelief as centuries of Assyrian history were obliterated in minutes. As we fight against the injustices perpetrated by ISIS militants around the world we must also fight to preserve the cultural integrity of these historical civilizations. I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their dedication in preserving the historical treasures of the people of Mosul. ISIS has robbed these people of their freedoms but we must protect their past so that they may have a better future.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking Mr. ELIOT ENGEL, the Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his bill, the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act, H.R. 1493.

I am privileged to be the lead co-sponsor of this bill, just as I was last year.

This bill could not be more timely, given the depredations of ISIS that we see played out on our TV screens when we turn on the nightly news—the horrific beheadings and killing of Christians and other religious minorities such as Yazidis by Islamist fanatics.

These murderers help finance their terror in part by looting cultural antiquities and coins from areas of Syria and Iraq that they control.

Congress has already acted with respect to banning importation of “blood antiquities” from Iraq, which this bill would now extend to Syria. As such, this bill is part of the war on terror, helping to dry up sources of terror financing.

We also see that these fanatics will destroy what they cannot loot. This bill increases the inter-agency cooperation, including involvement of “Monuments Men” units of our armed forces, in striving to protect a cultural heritage which is part of our world's patrimony.

Finally, I want to highlight a provision of this bill that was not in the version we passed in the last Congress, but one which is an important addition, namely, a safe-harbor provision for those who seek to bring into the country important cultural artifacts that are being threatened with destruction. This safe harbor provision allows them to be placed in the temporary protective custody of the United States government or a museum.

I want to close by thanking Ranking Member ENGEL for introducing this important piece of legislation, and would like to thank him and all staff members who worked so hard on bringing this important legislation to the floor tonight.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1493, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING THE FIRE-FIGHTERS LOST IN HOUSTON'S FIRE OFF THE SOUTHWEST FREEWAY

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, May 31, 2013, 2 years ago yesterday, at 12:08 p.m., a call is made to Houston 911. A large fire was burning off the Southwest Freeway. At 12:11, 3 minutes later, station 51 arrived. At 12:16 p.m., 5 minutes after that, station 68 arrived. At 12:23, a mayday was heard over the radio. The roof had collapsed.

That call was the last alarm for four firefighters: Matthew Renaud, 35 years old, station 51; Robert Bebee, 41 years old, station 51 as well; Robert Garner, 29 years old, station 68; and a young lady from my hometown, Anne Sullivan, 24 years old, fire station 68. They are in God's hands, and we will never forget them.

□ 2015

HONORING RABBI LES GUTTERMAN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rabbi Les Gutterman, my rabbi and a man who

has served for more than 40 years as the senior rabbi for Temple Beth-El in Providence, Rhode Island.

Rabbi Gutterman's unique insight and his sharp sense of humor have served the members of his congregation magnificently during times of personal struggle and times of great celebration.

As a member of the congregation at Temple Beth-El, I have often relied on Rabbi Gutterman's wise counsel and spiritual guidance, and I consider his friendship a great blessing in my life.

A native of Flint, Michigan, Rabbi Gutterman first came to Providence 45 years ago after earning a bachelor's degree from the University of Michigan and a Doctor of Divinity from Hebrew Union College.

At the time, just 27 years old, he could not have imagined the impact he would have on our State and on the families in his congregation. But just 3 years later, Rabbi Gutterman would be appointed the senior rabbi for Temple Beth-El, making him one of the youngest senior rabbis in the United States.

Today, he is known to all of us as “Rhode Island's rabbi,” a humble, caring servant of God who has tended to the spiritual needs of this great community for nearly half a century.

While we will miss his presence at Temple Beth-El, I know that all of us are wishing him, his wife Janet, and his daughters Rebecca and Elizabeth the very best as he embarks on a well-deserved retirement.

Thank you, Rabbi Gutterman, for your devotion to our community and for the gentle, caring guidance and love you have provided to us for so many years.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Speaker, with trade deals on the horizon, President Obama has asked Congress to grant him trade promotional authority, also called fast track, to “write the rules for the world's economy.” This measure would allow the President to pass sweeping trade partnerships without the input of the American people through their elected representatives in the normal process. Despite the various myths circulating about TPA, I sincerely believe that it is not in the best interest of our Nation, as written at this time.

You have heard it said that a vote against TPA is a vote against international trade, but actually, a vote against TPA is a vote for a better construct and trade agreement.

I am a strong supporter of trade when deals are negotiated strategically in the best interest of the United States economically, militarily, and diplomatically. With the President leaving office in just months, I have serious

concerns about the rapid pace and content of any deal that could have decades of implication.

Many have said TPA will strengthen our international relationships, and that may be, but while TPA would fast-track the Trans-Pacific Partnership, in specific, currently being negotiated by the President with 11 other Pacific nations, I am not convinced that this is a partnership that must be done in haste before the President leaves office.

We currently trade with 6 of the 11 other members. Our vital yet delicate relationship with China—a country not included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership—would likely be damaged by a rivalry for economic influence in the region. The Trans-Pacific Partnership rewards nations with serious human rights violations while slighting our faithful trade partners with shared values in Europe. While I support the lifting of trade barriers and promoting better standards of living, I believe we must do the right track, not the fast track.

Others have claimed TPA will strengthen national security. On this point we should take careful note. The President has used dangerous and isolating language regarding China, with words coming from the White House like “hegemony” and “containment” to ask for the TPA, or the trade promotional authority, but we must note that China is not our enemy. Therefore, we should not put it on the path to become one.

By isolating China, we could easily transform our capabilities-based defense strategy to a threat-based one, with all of the implication and decades of effort that that would entail. It would affect all of our future defense spending and could even begin Cold War II. The trade promotional authority can be granted and trade agreements inked without making China excluded, or worse, our enemy. We need to use the next 20 months to repair the relationships as we move towards better trade agreements.

The trade promotional authority, some say, gives Congress a seat at the negotiating table. But the TPA allows Congress to set broad objectives for negotiation—and that comes at a high price. Under the trade promotional authority, Congress sacrifices its authority to make any changes on the final deal, and they are left with a simple “yes” or “no” vote.

I believe the American people deserve their voice in trade agreements which impact all of our livelihoods and affect all of our families’ finances. And while trade is vital to economic opportunity and our international friendships, I cannot support granting the President permission in light of these concerns with trade promotional authority.

Madam Speaker, America has long been fascinated with China. From the time of Columbus, who sought to find a western approach to China and instead discovered America, we have been drawn to its ancient culture and its

people. The earliest American vessel pulled into a Canton port in 1748. Forty years later, we began free trade with the Cantonese.

The first mention of China obtaining a favored nation status was actually as early as 1844, when we signed the Treaty of Wanghia. The way seemed open to engage China and her market. But there were concerns. Wrote one negotiating diplomat regarding this treaty: “It is the most uncivilized and remote of all nations . . . it is in an isolated place outside the pale, solitary, and ignorant. Not only are the people entirely unversed in the forms of edicts and laws, but if the meaning be rather deep, they would probably not even be able to comprehend. It would seem that we must make our words somewhat simple.”

What is amusing is that the diplomat was Chinese, and his comments were directed toward the United States.

China moved ahead slowly and cautiously with its relations with the West. The interplay of Western covetousness with Chinese reluctance kept the door to China at a mere crack. European attempts to force the crack with opium and acquisition of port cities broadened the natural distrust.

Unlike demands of Europe, though, the United States wanted trade, not territory. U.S. Ambassador Burlingame was able to secure the first treaty that China ever made with any Western nation in 1861, and China was regarded as an equal. Chinese workers began to flock to the United States and literally began to move mountains in California as economic opportunity thrived.

Unfortunately, the goodwill of Lincoln faded in just one generation. The plundering of Chinese port cities by European competitors changed how Americans began to view China. The flood of Chinese immigrants to California became an easy target for any setback on its economic ascent. Equals were now called coolies. Racism reached such a height that in 1882 the United States Congress—this body—passed and the President signed the first ever act that excluded a specific race on immigration. We did not even make any pretense about it, calling it the Chinese Exclusion Act. The provisions remained in effect for nearly 60 years.

As these events played out, Commodore Perry of the United States Navy entered Tokyo in 1850 and demanded that Japan “open up.” The Japanese obliged.

Japan embarked on a stunning modernization program, where China was reluctant. In an incredible span of only 50 years, Japan adopted Western technology, governance, law, industry, and military doctrines. Her rise from mystic feudalism to world power alarmed the West. In response, the goodwill of Lincoln towards China would take hold again in the form of his youthful personal secretary, John Hay, now an older, wiser, and towering figure of respect serving as the Secretary of State in 1900.

Hay saw the best way to compete with Japan would be to open up China to trade while protecting her territory. Hays’ open-door policy was widely heralded across the globe as the solution to imperial Japanese ascendancy. This would have long-lasting implication, but one important side effect was to restore U.S.-Chinese relations. Hay even secured a guarantee from Japan in 1908 to respect China’s “open door,” independence, and territory. It would last only 7 years.

As China moved to become more enlightened to the West with Sun Yat-sen’s revolution in self-governance in China, Imperial Japan made what was known as the 21 Demands during World War I.

Great Britain and U.S. Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan moved quickly to prevent Japan from attempting to make China its own protectorate. American-Chinese relations warmed even further when the United States declared China’s right to autonomy with tariffs and trade in 1928.

As once-warm Japanese relations with the United States turned sour over Imperial Japanese policy in China regarding Manchuria, America established what became the Stimson doctrine, which refused to recognize Japanese acquisitions in China and upheld China’s rights to its own sovereignty.

The 1930s saw a mercurial Imperial Japan plunder China, pull out of the League of Nations, and commit horrific atrocities in Nanking and Hong Kong. The U.S. responded by calling for a global quarantine against Japan in defense of China in 1937. China’s own struggles internally with Mao Zedong’s Communists paled in comparison to losing its industrial heart and its coast to the Imperial Japanese army.

By 1941, America was sending lend-lease war material and economic aid to China in her defense. American volunteer pilots cut dashing figures as they flew American P-40 Warhawks for the Chinese Air Force as the famed Flying Tigers.

Ultimately, America’s defense of China led it to be attacked at Pearl Harbor and resulted in a brutal Pacific and Chinese theater of war during World War II.

□ 2030

The United States committed an entire effort in China, with “Vinegar Joe” Stilwell as the commanding general; the building of the Burma Road; and by training, equipping, and launching a Chinese Army to attack Japanese forces. Immigration restrictions that were imposed in 1882 were now finally repealed. America had sympathy for China’s struggle.

By war’s end, China was an important partner and ally. Her struggle did not end, however. Ripped again internally by civil war once the Japanese were defeated, China would be led by Mao Zedong and the Communist Party.

The United States did not recognize Communist China, but neither did it

materially aid fleeing Nationalist Chinese on the continent. A period of isolation and strained relations with the United States began once again under Mao.

In 1949, China began to arm Communists in French Indochina. The U.S. became embroiled in a deadly struggle with North Korea and countered her assault in the south with an attack that pushed them all the way north to the Yalu River on the Chinese border.

Alarmed, China struck back. For the first time since 1900, Americans and Chinese were fighting each other. By 1953, an uneasy line had settled on the Korean Peninsula.

Chinese relations remained cool with the West, but were not always promising with the Soviet Russia. When the U.S. fought in Vietnam, China continued to arm and send troops to the Communist government of Ho Chi Minh.

Then a series of odd events from 1969 to 1971 brought Americans and Chinese back to warmer relations in the most unlikely way. When Soviet Russia attacked outposts on the northern border of China, Mao Zedong reassessed relationships with the United States.

He reasoned that China could not be isolated by both world powers. Overtures from President Nixon in his inaugural address and a series of ping-pong matches created dialogue for the first time in decades.

In 1971, Henry Kissinger went on a secret mission to China, opening the way for Nixon's visit with Mao. Who would have thought that the man that shunned the United States in favor of communism and the President that built his reputation on fighting communism would both come to realize that our nations, despite their differences, needed each other.

Mainland China was now officially recognized by the United Nations. The U.S. set up diplomatic offices. Trade agreements opened. Relations warmed by the 1980s, with state visits from both countries. As the horizon brightened and the Chinese people hoped, the Chinese Government cracked down on dissidents in Tiananmen Square. The U.S., alarmed, imposed sanctions and restrictions.

Tensions loomed through the 1990s, culminating with the U.S. bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, Serbia, in 1999, during the Kosovo campaign.

Calmer heads prevailed and tensions eased. By 2001, trade restrictions were loosened once again. China pledged a deep commitment to fight the war on terror and committed material aid in great amounts for the effort.

By 2006, China-U.S. relations deepened under the strategic economic dialogue. Business in both countries increased as commerce offered great economic opportunity for both countries.

On the verge of a bright future, we now see today with timidity and fear, where we should see opportunity and favor with regard to China.

China needs us, and we need China; yet we see, in the last week, Madam

Speaker, a week of a barrage of negative press on China, covering everything from hedging them on trade, to condemning them and their development of island outposts in the China Sea, to framing them up as the new military threat that must be checked by the United States.

Dialogue and diplomacy are cheaper than tanks and tomahawks. Does the United States really wish to believe that we can leave a capabilities-based military to create some new threat-based military and it would be in our favor?

While China is not our enemy, we could certainly set the conditions to make them one in the future. It would be a tragic mistake. It would devour our diplomacy, drain our defense, and diminish our domestic priorities.

Worse, it could set the course for some future horrific conflict between dozens of friendly nations that we currently trade with, including China—including China. Where is the dialogue on including China in the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

I have not heard it from this Chamber or the White House. Sure, we claim they can join if they meet the standard, only after we use every anti-Chinese statement in trying to make the case for the trade promotion authority. That is not very reassuring.

Some say we must not include China at all in the Trans-Pacific Partnership because of their human rights record. Others object because they are a Communist nation. Others cite the fact that China has been our former enemy.

Well, here are some thoughts to ponder. If we can forgive Germany and Japan for horrific human rights violations in World War II, can we not reach out to China? If we can embrace former enemies who reformed their existing Communist governments, such as Vietnam, can we not reach out to China?

If we can turn former enemies, such as Great Britain, Canada, Mexico, Spain, the Philippines, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Japan, and Vietnam, into our top trading partners, can we not also reach out to China?

China needs petroleum and natural gas, and we have plenty of it. We have both ready to export. China wants to lay thousands of miles of road in ambitious projects for her commerce. We have the raw materials for asphalt, industry to make their road-paving machines, and colleges to educate their engineers.

Madam Speaker, we need China; 3.8 million Chinese nationals live and work in the United States. That is more than the population of my home State of Oklahoma. China constitutes our greatest trading partner, working with thousands of businesses that bolster our economy and better our quality of life. Our peoples are historically and deeply intertwined. We must proceed with wisdom and caution.

While we love trade and while we love economy, we can work out differences, rather than magnify them

and deepen suspicion and concern. Instead, we can dialogue.

The same standards that people often cite with regard to China and how she is stealing technologies or making shoddy goods were the same charges that we leveled against Japan in the 1960s and South Korea in the 1980s; yet we no longer have those concerns about those allies today with their incredible effort, economy, and technology.

Our peoples are historically and deeply entwined, the United States and China, and we must work hard to maintain that.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that our colleagues and our President would temper the rhetoric with regard to discussions on trade and using it as some new effort to hedge or contain China, rather than to embrace and trade with that nation.

Whatever differences we may have can be worked out in the spirit and good will of Lincoln.

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

THE CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to once again have the opportunity to stand on the House floor and to anchor the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Today, we will discuss the many economic challenges facing so many everyday Americans; and, specifically, tonight, we want to examine some of the economic barriers, some of the policy possibilities, and the outlook on job prospects for African Americans in districts that we represent across the country.

It is worth beginning with the fact that we are now about 6 years removed from the end of what historians and economists deem the Great Recession. America's economy has rallied. We have inched our way closer and closer to full recovery. In fact, the beginning of 2015 saw the most sustained period of job creation in this century.

The fact remains that, in spite of the steady stream of progress and even in the midst of our positive job numbers, there are still too many people being left behind. Many of these people live in communities like the ones I represent in Cook County and Kankakee.

Many of these people can be found in urban, central, or rural America.

I guarantee that we all know someone out there who is still in the midst of their own personal economic recovery. The fact remains that many communities of color are struggling mightily in their recovery. In many Black and Brown neighborhoods, unemployment remains at a crisis level—this, even as our economy continues to rebound.

I am reminded of a quote by a former National Urban League president and civil rights hero that the hardest work in the world is being out of work. That is something that I personally believe.

So often, I will hear folks say that America's unemployed have made a choice to not work, that vulnerable Americans looking for work are doing so because they have made poor decisions. We hear this time and time again, especially in this Chamber, about folks need to go pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

I can tell you that I have seen people tug in vain on their bootstraps to no avail. Many families still need help in their recovery. As Representatives, we need to hear their cry and do more.

Marc Morial, who has followed in the footsteps of Whitney Young and taken the helm of the National Urban League, was recently quoted as saying: "It is clear that for too many Blacks and Latinos, our Nation's economic recovery is only something they read or hear about."

America's comeback is bypassing large swaths of people in Black and Brown neighborhoods, and that is dangerous not only to those communities, but to our Nation. A recovery that leaves millions of its citizens behind will ultimately threaten America's sustained growth.

Even before the Great Recession, Black unemployment has consistently been twice as high as White unemployment. I think Congressman PAYNE and my colleagues gathered here this evening would agree that we have to address this problem now.

To again quote Mr. Morial, of the National Urban League, "For Blacks and Latinos in America, the economic devastation of the Great Recession is as real today as it was when it began in 2007."

Consider these statistics on the economic reality of many Africans Americans, according to a Brandeis University study. A typical Black household has accumulated less than one-tenth of the wealth of a typical White one, and that number is getting worse.

Over the past 25 years, the wealth gap between Blacks and Whites has nearly tripled. Now, this is largely because homeownership among Blacks is so much lower. Housing is often America's greatest asset and a major component of their overall wealth.

African Americans typically have lower incomes than Whites, which also makes it harder for them to save and build wealth. The median income for

Black households is less than 60 percent of that of White ones. Finally, the jobless rate for Black Americans is twice that of Whites.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. The necessity in responding to this economic crisis should be an American imperative. We cannot be limited by narrowly focusing on a pre-Recession economy.

The Members of this House should be strategizing to support a bold and inclusive economy that propels us into a sustainable future. More can be done by us, and this administration has proven to have been willing to take the positive steps necessary to put us on a more prosperous path.

Regardless of where some of our colleagues are when it comes to the President, I think we are all in agreement that more Americans in the workforce and more economic stimulation benefits all of us.

□ 2045

The question is still relevant: How do we create a stronger economy and a more perfect union? Where do we go from here?

I am very pleased again to be joined tonight by my distinguished colleague from the Congressional Black Caucus as we discuss this important analysis of the economy and job opportunity in our communities.

The insight and policy prescriptions are critical and valuable in our continuing march toward a more perfect union. Let me first yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my dynamic coanchor.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to start by thanking my colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman KELLY, for coanchoring this Special Order with me.

Thanks also to the members of the Congressional Black Caucus that will be joining us, and a special thanks to everyone watching at home.

It is wonderful to be here to talk about our shared priorities. Tonight, as stated by my colleague, we are going to address two of the most pressing issues for African American communities, jobs and economic development.

Since the Recession ended, much of the United States has experienced economic recovery. However, African American communities continue to face significant challenges to securing jobs, escaping poverty, and accumulating wealth.

It is a disturbing and unacceptable reality and a reminder that Congress has a moral responsibility to create avenues of economic prosperity for African American communities. Our focus must be on the economic issues that matter most to African American communities, including employment, income, and wealth.

According to an April report by the U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee, at 10.1 percent, the unemployment rate for African Americans is double the rate for White Americans.

African Americans are 2.5 times more likely than White Americans to face long-term unemployment, and over 20 percent of African Americans in their early twenties are still unemployed. This hurts earning prospects and long-term employment.

Given the higher rates of unemployment in African American communities, it is no surprise that African American communities also have lower incomes and less wealth, and African Americans are more likely to live and stay in poverty.

According to the April Joint Economic Committee report, the median income of an African American household is only \$34,600, almost \$24,000 less than White households in this country. African Americans are almost three times more likely to live in poverty than White Americans. African American households have 13 times less wealth than White households.

In my State of New Jersey, the statistics are equally as grim. In New Jersey, the poverty rate for African Americans hovers at 22 percent and is three times that of White Americans, at 6.6 percent. The unemployment rate for African Americans is 11.1 percent, and that is twice that of White Americans, at 5.5 percent.

According to U.S. Census Bureau estimates, in New Jersey, in the 10th Congressional District, the unemployment rate for African Americans is 19.1 percent, which was 2.5 times that of White Americans, at 7.5 percent. These glaring disparities betray the American promise, that working hard leads to economic stability.

African American women's unemployment today—more women are the primary breadwinners for their families than ever. In fact, 30 percent of women earn more than their husbands. Women make up nearly half of our Nation's workforce.

However, on average, full-time working women earn just 77 cents for every dollar a man earns, and African American women earn just 64 cents for every dollar a man earns.

African American women have been hit particularly hard by unemployment. According to the National Women's Law Center, in April, African American women's unemployment was at 8.8 percent, higher than the peak of total women's unemployment during the Recession. Compare that to the 4.2 percent unemployment rate for White women and to the national unemployment rate of 5.4 percent.

We need a more widely shared recovery. We cannot strengthen our households or our economy when such large disparities exist.

The Congressional Black Caucus is committed to tackling this challenge. The CBC has fought for much-needed investment in job training, in education, and in employment opportunities to equip people of color and people from low-income communities with the skills needed to compete in today's economy.

Education is definitely key to this prosperity. It is best when we invest in it and make it possible for all youngsters—all Americans—to get a good education.

Education is the path to success, but many people simply can't afford it. African Americans lag sharply behind White Americans in educational attainment as well. It is a consistent theme that we hear—whether it is poverty, education, wealth, job opportunities—that these communities lag behind.

We need a strong nation, irrespective of what community you live in. Here in Congress and at this CBC, we fight every day to make sure that all Americans have an equal opportunity to prosper in this Nation.

I see we have been very fortunate to be joined by several of our colleagues.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. It is my pleasure and delight to yield to the gentlewoman from Oakland, California (Ms. LEE), who always has great things to share with us.

Ms. LEE. First, let me thank you, Congresswoman KELLY and Congressman PAYNE, for hosting this Special Order. Your leadership is so important for these critical discussions.

We are trying in many ways under your leadership to really tell the truth and let the entire country know exactly what the economic status is, what the job opportunities and educational opportunities are in the African American community, and how those disparities continue to grow and, really, how we need to really do everything we can here to begin to close those gaps and disparities, so thank you very much once again.

We stand here tonight to discuss economic opportunity—of course, I have to say the lack of opportunity in the Black community. In recent months, we have seen communities across this country—including Baltimore and my hometown of Oakland, California, in my congressional district—demand an end to the systemic and institutional racial biases that plague our society.

People, especially young people, are calling for an end to centuries of oppression. They are fighting for equality of opportunity, the opportunity for every American to live the American Dream.

Too many places in our Nation are tales of two cities. One city is bright, shiny, and new. It is home to new condominiums and fancy restaurants. The other city is left with boarded up stores, abandoned homes, and too many people without a job and without hope.

I know Congresswoman KELLY, Congressman PAYNE, Congressman JEFFRIES, myself, all of us represent these cities, these two cities within one context, one environment, one framework, one boundary.

We all know that the inequality of opportunity really is not a new phenomenon. We have lived with these structural injustices for centuries, but

it wasn't until the race riots erupted in Watts, Chicago, and Detroit in 1968 that our government began to take some notice.

After the riots, President Johnson convened the Kerner Commission to investigate the root causes of the unrest. The Kerner report clearly showed a nation moving towards two societies: one Black, one White—separate and unequal. While the Kerner report identified the problem, our Nation failed to truly address it. There still is not liberty and justice for all.

The Kerner report also called for better training for police, new investments in jobs and in housing, and the end of de facto segregation. Now, this report really could have been written last month.

Sadly, nearly 50 years later, we still live in a country where the color of your skin and the ZIP Code in which you were born determines your future, but I am proud to be working with members of the Congressional Black Caucus to continue to address these persistent inequalities in our Nation by working on policies and programs to create economic growth, educational opportunities, and job opportunities.

For example, we know that Black children are disadvantaged from day one. More than one in three Black children are born in poverty. That is one in three. In the world's richest and most powerful Nation, a third of all African American children are forced to grow up with the harsh reality of poverty, day in and day out. This is outrageous. It is unacceptable.

The cycle of poverty continues in the school systems that institutionalize this discrimination. While Black students represent just 18 percent of preschool enrollment, they account for 42 percent of preschool student expulsions.

Can you believe that? Preschool student expulsions—that is really a disgrace. We are talking about kids ages 2 to 5 years old. These kids don't even get a start, let alone a Head Start. What in the world are children that young doing being expelled from preschool?

Then in high school, the graduation rate for Black students is 16 points lower than the rate for their White peers. Black students are far less likely than their White counterparts to obtain a 4-year college degree, and the crisis and inequality extends from education to the economy itself.

Over the past four decades, the unemployment rate for Blacks has remained nearly double the rate for Whites. Today, the unemployment rate in the Black community stands at 10.1 percent; that is reported. Now, to put that into context, the current African American unemployment rate is higher than the national average was at the height of the Great Recession.

In addition to higher unemployment rates, African Americans are also nearly completely locked out of some key economic sectors, especially the tech sector.

Only 1 in 14 technical workers in Silicon Valley is African American or Latino. That is 1 in 14. That is why the CBC has launched the TECH 2020 initiative to work with the tech sector to increase workforce diversity and investments in STEM education and to expand market opportunities for businesses to ensure that the jobs of today and tomorrow are open to all.

For African Americans in the workforce, our Nation's inequalities are also evident in their paychecks. Congressman PAYNE just laid out the statistics for women. While women earn 77 cents on the dollar that a man earns, it is just 64 cents for African American women. The median income for Blacks is a mere \$34,000. That is nearly \$24,000 less than the median income for Whites.

Most Black families hold their wealth in home equity, so the Great Recession hit the Black community particularly hard. Too many families lost everything, and many more Black families are struggling as home prices fail to keep pace with the stock market. Of course, the net worth now of African American families is now 6 cents to the dollar for White families.

The time for action is now. These communities, our communities, cannot wait any longer. We must come together like never before to address the inequalities in our Nation that leave Black families behind.

In my role as co-chair of the CBC's Task Force on Poverty and the Economy and chair of the Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, we are working very hard to give Black families a fair shot. We are talking about all families, not leaving any family behind.

I am proud to be working with more than 100 of my colleagues to advance policies that build pathways out of poverty into the middle class for everyone, for all Americans.

□ 2100

Yes, Black lives, like all lives, do count.

We have introduced the Half in Ten Act to develop a national strategy to cut poverty in half in the next decade. This bill would lift more than 22 million Americans out of poverty into the middle class in just the next 10 years by doubling down and coordinating proven antipoverty programs.

The Congressional Black Caucus also took a stand on poverty in its alternative budget proposal. We called for robust investments in education, infrastructure, and affordable housing programs that would ensure opportunities for all. We must keep up this fight until Congress makes these long overdue investments.

We need to strengthen the social safety net and invest in proven antipoverty programs such as the earned income tax credit and the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program. These were initiatives begun 50

years ago under President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society program, and they are working.

We also need to raise the minimum wage and fight for a living wage. That is why we are cosponsors, and we are very proud to be cosponsors, of H.R. 122, the Original Living Wage Act, sponsored by Congressman AL GREEN, which starts by raising the minimum wage for Federal workers and building up to a living wage. And Congressman BOBBY SCOTT's Raise the Wage Act, H.R. 2150, would increase the minimum wage to \$12 by 2020. Thirty-five million Americans would benefit from this.

Also we wrote a letter signed by 72 colleagues urging the President to adopt a fair chance hiring policy at the Federal level for individuals who have been previously incarcerated. A fair chance hiring policy would level the playing field and help stop the cycle of recidivism that is plaguing our communities. This is simply the right thing to do. The Federal Government should not put up barriers to work for those trying to rebuild their lives after making a mistake and having paid their dues to society.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am saying tonight, and I think all of us are saying, that we need to give families the opportunity to build wealth and live the American Dream. We can end poverty not just in the African American community, but in the entire United States as a whole. So we have got to keep calling for action.

As Dr. King said in his "Two Americas" speech that he gave on April 14, 1968, at Stanford University, 1968, he said: "We must come to see that social progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of dedicated individuals."

Mr. Speaker, we must be those dedicated individuals working for the social progress that is so desperately needed. When you look at the analysis of the economy, job opportunities and educational opportunities in the African American community, we must win this fight because the gaps and the disparities are too great. Only then will America be strong, because we have to remember that we are a country where everyone is equal under the law. In fact, when you have communities with such horrible statistics as we are laying out tonight, such horrible economic and educational gaps, our country is not as strong as it could be. And so we are saying that we want liberty and justice for everyone, that all lives matter, including Black lives.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE. Thank you for your hard work, your dedication, and all of your insight. You are so right about ZIP Codes that determine so much, unfortunately. And we have to give every young child, every family, a fair chance, and hopefully we will see the day when some of the bills that we have put forward actually are brought to the floor and voted on in a positive way. So thank you so very much.

It is now my pleasure and honor to call to the floor and introduce Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, from the great State of New York and the borough of Brooklyn. Thank you HAKEEM.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois, ROBIN KELLY, for yielding, for her very generous introduction, and certainly to my good friend and classmate, DONALD PAYNE, for co-anchoring this Special Order. And as well, I want to acknowledge the presence of distinguished Congresswoman BARBARA LEE from California for her continued eloquence and contribution on such a significant issue.

I really count it an honor and a privilege to once again have the opportunity to come to the House floor to participate in this Special Order hour, this CBC hour of power, co-anchored by the dynamic duo of D. PAYNE and R. KELLY. We really appreciate their continued involvement, eloquence, and leadership in helping to articulate for the American people, as part of this conversation that we are able to have periodically, the issues of great importance to the African American community, but issues that I believe are also of great importance to the broader American community.

Poverty is an issue that certainly impacts the city of Newark that Congressman PAYNE represents, the city of Oakland that BARBARA LEE represents, the city of Chicago that Congresswoman KELLY represents, and part of the city of New York that I represent in part. Even though the ZIP Codes for those four particular municipalities may be different, the issues of lack of economic community opportunity, of course, are largely the same. Far too many people do not robustly have an opportunity to pursue the American Dream in a manner that is consistent with what America is supposed to be, a place where, if you just work hard and stay on the right path, you have an opportunity to lift yourself up out of the station that you may have been born into in life. But we know, unfortunately, that race seems to play a role in that capacity to pull yourself up by your bootstraps.

In fact, while one in three Whites who find themselves in poverty have the ability, it appears, to elevate themselves out of it—and those numbers may even be a little higher—only one in five African Americans appear to have the capacity to lift themselves out of an impoverished condition that they find themselves in.

Why that is the case is something that I think we need to be able to explore, because regardless of race, it should be a matter of fact here in America that everyone has got a chance to be able to provide for their families to live a middle class lifestyle.

Now, the interesting thing that I found upon my arrival here at the Congress is that issues related to poverty really shouldn't be a Black issue or a White issue, a Democratic issue or a

Republican issue. It shouldn't be an urban issue or a rural issue. It is an American issue. In fact, when you look at what has often been defined as persistently poor counties, counties where 20 percent of the population have been below the Federal poverty line for 30 or more years, more of those persistently poor counties are actually represented in this wonderful body by Republicans than by Democrats. So for the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out why we have not been able to come together and find common ground to deal with the problem of poverty in America, because this is not some narrow constituent issue that those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus happen to have and our friends on the other side of the aisle aren't experiencing in terms of the people that they represent. This is actually an issue that needs to be addressed by everybody.

So I am hopeful that as we stand on this House floor, as we extend our hands out in partnership to the other side of the aisle, that we can begin to deal with some of these issues, like, for instance, giving America a raise. For the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out why we would essentially endorse a policy, a minimum wage standard that means you can work full-time, 52 weeks a year, 40 hours a week, and still, when raising a family of three or four, live below the Federal poverty line. Why aren't we making work pay in America?

Now, we are seeing that places like Los Angeles that recently raised the minimum wage to \$15 an hour are leading the way at the local level, and I guess that makes sense. Brandeis once said that State government, local governments, are laboratories of democracy, and here I found that the House is probably more like the lion's den of democracy. But it seems to me that we should be able to figure out a pathway toward dealing with some common-sense solutions to dealing with the economic problems that face everyday Americans, like investing in research and development, investing in education and job training, investing in technology and innovation, investing in transportation and infrastructure, and investing in the American worker in a way that makes sense because the deck has been stacked against him, the African American worker or the individual within the African American community that is desperately trying to seek work.

We are suffering from double-digit unemployment in this recovery. When other communities seem to have been able to get back on track and our unemployment numbers are still higher than the collective number during the Great Recession, that is a scandal. We should all have a problem with that.

But the deck generally is stacked against the American worker. Since the early 1970s, the productivity of the American worker has increased in excess of 275 percent. American workers have been more productive over the

last 40-plus years, yet during that same time period, wages have increased less than 10 percent. They have remained stagnant. The deck is stacked.

The increase in productivity of the American worker has gone to the privileged few, and we have seen that that has continued during this recovery where corporate profits are way up, the stockmarket is way up, and CEO compensation is way up, but people in the African American community and others are still struggling to be able to recover from the devastating impact that the collapse of the economy had on our community and on many communities throughout America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my good friends for raising the issue, for once again standing before the American people to address this great issue of significance.

We were all in recess over the last few days back at home, spread across the country, but now we have come back. We are here for 4 conservative weeks to do the people's business, and I am hopeful we can figure out a way to deal with a laser-like focus the problems confronting the persistently poor and those who are in the middle class or trying to become part of the great American middle class.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you very much, Congressman JEFFRIES. You always have great words, well thought out and so meaningful. I really appreciate your comments.

With that, I would like to turn it over to the woman from the great State of Ohio, my colleague, my freshman colleague and now sophomore colleague, Congressman JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, and to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Congressional Black Caucus this evening for holding this Special Order hour focusing on the economy and job opportunities in our community. I know tonight that we will speak to America and to the folks in this Chamber talking about the issues that revolve around the economy and jobs and how it affects African Americans.

I want to join my colleagues tonight and talk about those things that get in the way when we talk about our education system, when we talk about the young African Americans going to prison, and when we talk about the cost of higher education, Mr. Speaker. But I also want to say thank you, thank you to the HBC universities for educating African Americans. I want to say thank you to those African Americans who are in positions to help spur the economy, and having an African American in the White House. That is because along the way there has been hope and opportunity.

□ 2115

So before I talk about those things that get in the way, I want to make sure that we send the message to a 12-

year-old boy in my district, to a freshman in college, to individuals like my young nephew and my nieces and my grandchildren, that there will be hope and opportunity because there are Members in this Chamber and members in the Congressional Black Caucus who will come and stand up and build that hope and opportunity to make a difference because we will come with resolve.

But tonight, I want to share that, while much has changed for African Americans since the 1963 March on Washington, one thing has not changed. The unemployment rate among Blacks is about double that among Whites, as it has been for almost the past six decades.

Mr. Speaker, the current unemployment rate for African Americans is 9.6 percent. This is nearly twice the 4.7 percent unemployment rate for White Americans.

Although the national unemployment rate has continued to decline since 2008, a significant race gap still remains. African Americans are almost three times more likely to live in poverty than White Americans.

African Americans, like all Americans, want economic mobility, access to high wages, the ability to support themselves and their families in a middle class lifestyle, while earning wages to allow for the accumulation of wealth.

To move forward in creating economic opportunities in the African American community, we must remain focused, focused as the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are, on how we can bridge the divides in our society, and how we can bring our Nation closer together.

It is well established in the fact that students of color face harsher punishments in schools than their White peers, leading to a higher number of youth of color in detention, suspension, and even being expelled.

African American students are arrested far more often than their White classmates. Black and Hispanic students, Mr. Speaker, represent more than 70 percent of those in school-related arrests or referrals to law enforcement. African Americans make up two-fifths and Hispanics one-fifth of confined youth today.

Disparities are found not only in how we punish behavior in our schools, but also how we fund education. This is true in K-12, and it is also true with higher education.

While we know that a college degree is a path to a middle class life, African Americans are less likely to obtain education beyond high school than White students, and they are less likely to earn a degree.

And for those African American college students who are able to make it to graduation, after graduating they graduate with more student debt than White students. Continued Federal and State cuts to tuition assistance, grant programs, and work study opportuni-

ties continue to threaten African American access to a better education.

We must confront these injustices head on. We have an obligation to find real solutions to these problems that have plagued our communities for generations. We must promote policies that increase the pace of job creation, expand opportunities for the long-term unemployed to reenter the workforce. We must provide incentives for businesses to hire and make investments in revitalizing schools, infrastructures, and our neighborhoods.

Like we did 50 years ago as we were in Selma, we must continue to do that again today. We must continue to stand arm in arm so we can bring an end to the disparities that hold our hard-working families back from achieving the middle class dream and the dreams of all Americans that we all should be equal, Mr. Speaker.

And again, to my colleagues, thank you for holding this Special Order hour. Thank you for working with the members of the Congressional Black Caucus and all of our colleagues so we could move forward and not have the disparities that you have heard about tonight.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you Congresswoman BEATTY, and thank you for your words, and also thank you for your insight, as well as our other colleagues that have shared this evening with us tonight. We really, really appreciate it. And we hope that when we come back next year this time that we can see some improvements and not have to talk about the same things over and over and over. We have heard back from 1968 some of the same statistics, and here we are so many years later still having to talk about the same thing. So we hope to see progress toward this economic stability for the African American family.

We have heard from my colleagues some staggering statistics. The story is even more disconcerting for our Nation's youth. Workers 19 years old and younger are finding it more difficult than ever to find quality afterschool and summer employment. The unemployment rate for White youth age 16 to 19 stands at 14.5 percent—again, roughly half that of their Black teenage counterparts, who have an unemployment rate of 27.5 percent.

Over one in four Black teenagers who are looking for work are unable to find it. Over one in four. This is simply unacceptable. As a Nation, we must do more to invest in underserved communities and provide opportunities for self-empowerment and growth for our Nation's youth.

Denying African American teens a summer job could cause them to miss out on a lifetime of opportunities and experiences. Many high school students use the summer months to work and put money aside for college. But if there are no jobs to be found, Mr. Speaker, many students will be denied the opportunity to attend college and will forever be shut out from many opportunities and will forever be shut out

also from the many jobs that require a college degree.

With college graduates earning an average of \$45,000 per year, compared to those only with a high school diploma earning an average of \$28,000 per year, lacking a college degree can set non-college graduates up for a lifetime of economic difficulties and frustrations. That is almost \$1 million in lost wages over the course of a lifetime.

I have been working in my district to connect employers with eager young employees. In April, I hosted my second annual Youth Employment Summit, where local youth aged 15 to 24 could connect with area companies. Many were hired on the spot, and even more were scheduled interviews for jobs and internships this summer.

But job fairs alone are not the answer, Mr. Speaker. As a Nation, we need increased investment in job training, infrastructure investment, and community development. In the long run, any economic growth that doesn't allow for full participation of all Americans, including those traditionally marginalized like minorities and young people, will not be sustainable. Our economy must work for everyone, not just a select few.

Continuing to leave underserved communities behind will only perpetuate and expand the great disparities in wealth between American citizens and continue to breed a cycle of poverty, violence, and a sense of helplessness in those communities.

Reinvesting in our Nation's youth and our Nation's minority communities is not only vital to our country's economic health but to its public health as well.

Lack of economic opportunity leads to violence, and violence only perpetuates a lack of economic opportunity. The two go hand-in-hand, and, if not addressed, it will create a downward spiral, preventing any positive growth for our Nation's youth and disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will recognize the first annual National Gun Violence Awareness Day. Like many of my colleagues, I will wear orange. Orange is the color hunters wear to alert their companions of their presence, to avoid being shot. It is a warning color. Orange screams: "Don't shoot."

Too many of my constituents often feel like they have to wear orange while walking down their block on Chicago's South Side. In fact, tomorrow is Hadiya Pendleton's birthday. As we all know, she was shot while playing in a park or running away.

Mr. Speaker, I often say that nothing stops a bullet like a job. The surest way to decrease violence and increase economic prosperity in underserved communities is to expand access to jobs and education.

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois and also the gentlewoman from Ohio for joining us this evening. Her thoughts and comments are always salient and to the point,

and we appreciate her supporting us in this effort. We sophomores have to stick together. It is just always a delight for me to be able to hear what Mrs. BEATTY has to say in terms of the topics that we discuss. She has demonstrated true leadership in the CBC since her arrival.

Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth, and there are many issues, many mottos, many sayings that go along with this Nation. And one of them is that all men are created equal. But why do we continue to find such gaps in all people being created equal and the circumstances some communities find themselves in?

Like anyone, young African Americans would like to grow up, educated well, raise their families, and eke out an income that sustains them and creates a quality of life that all people deserve. But that doesn't happen. We have the haves and the have-nots, the 99 percent and the 1 percent. And too often it seems like that is what our Nation is built on. Sure, we talk about equality, we talk about equal rights, but for some reason, in many instances, it just doesn't seem to fit the circumstance.

Wages for working people have stagnated, as my colleague from New York said, over 15 years, but we have watched the top 1 percent make more and more money. Their quality of life is something people would dream about, hear about in fairy tales. But, no, some people are living that well while others struggle every single day.

And what would it be in a Nation if we were held to these different virtues, to these different mottos, to these different sayings? Well, it would mean, Mr. Speaker, that people needing food stamps wouldn't be going up. That is not something people look forward to. That is a last-ditch effort to feed your family. That is desperation. That is not a goal to aspire to.

Too many times we feel that people in this country that have not made it or have found it difficult to be successful, well, they are just not doing what they need to do. There are systemic structural circumstances in this Nation that keep people from attaining success. And until we deal with those issues, we will continue to see what we see.

And let me just say that why wouldn't we want more people to have prosperity? Why wouldn't we want more people to be doing well? That means they are paying into the system, that they don't have to rely on the system and take out of the system. The more people paying in, the more it reduces the burden of the rest of us. I don't see why that is not clear.

I made the same example during our talks about the Affordable Care Act. The more people you have paying into the system, the less we have to pay because, guess what. When there is someone who is not paying into the system, guess who picks up the burden—the rest of us.

□ 2130

If you disburse that cost over more people—it is basic economics—guess what happens? It reduces it for everyone.

Here we are in the greatest nation in the world—no question about it—and at times, we are talking around the world about how other countries should treat their people. You have to look inside, and people are able to point back at us and say: Wait a minute. Why do you have communities such as that? Why is there such disparity? How can you tell us when we see what is happening in your nation?

Mr. Speaker, we can't talk out of both sides of our mouths. If we are going to be the greatest nation, then we have to act like it and stand up and do the things that make it a great nation.

There is no reason we cannot find a way out of this problem. We are able to create jobs as we have smart businesspeople throughout this Nation if there were an incentive for them to do it, but the status quo is all right with them because their value continues to go up, that of the 1 percent, so why should they change?

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. That is their motto. They are doing better and better while, for the rest of us, our quality of life goes down or remains stagnant.

Mr. Speaker, this has had an adverse impact on African American businesses, and in an increasingly connected economy, it is also detrimental to the broader economic growth in this country in that all people are not able to have a living wage or to take care of their families.

I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman KELLY, for her leadership and for leading tonight's Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour.

In closing, as we welcome the continued recovery and growth of our economy, we must keep in mind that work remains to build an equal society and to expand opportunities for African Americans across the country. African American communities are not sharing in the economic recovery.

We have a moral obligation to tackle the economic challenges facing Black communities and to create avenues of economic prosperity for all Americans. The CBC will be at that fight for as long as necessary. It is our agenda that works for all Americans, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, White Americans.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman PAYNE.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank my colleagues for giving the Congressional Black Caucus and this Congress the opportunity to put the important economic concerns of this Nation's in the spotlight this evening. Millions of Americans are living on the brink.

These aren't merely concerns for these individuals and their families;

they are national concerns. I have always believed that what makes our Nation great is our recognition that everyone should have the ability to live and rise to their full potential. Economic parity is one of the most fundamental issues facing us as a nation right now.

I hope, in this hour, we have appropriately shed some light on some of the concerns of the Congressional Black Caucus when it comes to the economy and to job opportunities in our communities—or the lack of them.

Again, I want to thank my coanchor, the Honorable Donald Payne, Jr., who himself is a strong defender of the economic possibilities of Newark, of Orange, and of communities across New Jersey's 10th Congressional District.

I will close as I began this evening in saying that the time to act is now. The necessity in responding to the economic crises of Black employment and underemployment should be an American imperative. The time is now to support a bold and inclusive economy that propels us into a sustainable future.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus in opposition to income inequality in the United States. As millions of Americans remain without work, while others are underpaid or underemployed, it is imperative that we address the growing threat to our country that is income inequality.

Since the 1970s, we have witnessed a dangerous trend develop where wage growth for middle and lower income households has become stagnant while incomes at the very top continue to rise sharply. From 1973 to 2005, real hourly wages for the top 10 percent rose by 30 percent or more, whereas the bottom 50 percent of all Americans experienced only marginal real wage increases of a little more than 5 percent.

The income gap is further amplified when comparing races. Overall, Caucasian males earn a median income of more than \$40,000 per year while African American males average roughly \$30,000 during the same time period. Hispanic Americans average just over \$26,000 each year. These discrepancies by race are particularly alarming, considering that these figures are even lower for women.

The percentage of wealth controlled by the richest Americans is another disturbing fact that is often overlooked. The top 1 percent of Americans own 40 percent of our entire nation's wealth, while the bottom 80 percent of Americans share only 7 percent of the nation's wealth. In historical terms, the last time our nation faced such a wide income gap was during the 1920s leading up to the Great Depression.

Mr. Speaker, while Congress struggles with raising the minimum wage, millions of working individuals and families across the country continue to struggle with stagnant pay and rising inflation. Until we take a serious look at comprehensive reform to curb income inequality, the consequences will continue harming our communities of color, and prove catastrophic for our nation's economy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a flight delay.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of her daughter's high school graduation.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and June 2.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a delayed flight.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. TAKAI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending daughter's graduation.

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 22, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2496. To extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on May 26, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2353. To provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1690. To designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis, Jr. United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 2, 2015, 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:

1660. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James M. Kowalski, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1661. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Blood and Blood Components Intended for Transfusion or for Further Manufacturing Use [Docket No.: FDA-2006-N-0040 (formerly Docket No.: 2006N-0221)] (RIN: 0910-AG87) received May 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1662. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the "Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts" report, pursuant to Sec. 10(a) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1663. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-67, "Prohibition of Pre-Employment Marijuana Testing Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1664. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-68, "Events DC Technical Clarification Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1665. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-69, "Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Reauthorization Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1666. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-70, "Soccer Stadium Development Technical Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1667. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-71, "Medical Marijuana Supply Shortage Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1668. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-72, "Jubilee Maycroft TOPA Notice Exemption Temporary Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1669. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Purchase Price Safe Harbors for sections 143 and 25 (Rev. Proc. 2015-31) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1670. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — June 2015 (Rev. Rul. 2015-14) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1671. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2015 (Notice 2015-32) received June 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-135). 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. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 2584. A bill to regulate certain State taxation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 2585. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 2586. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to make improvements to the trade promotion policies and programs of the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2587. A bill to further enhance the promotion of exports of United States goods and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BOST, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BUCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 2588. A bill to reform the H-2A program for nonimmigrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 2589. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on its Internet website changes to the rules of the Commission not later than 24 hours after adoption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 2590. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include certain individuals who work on farms or ranches as individuals who are employed in public service jobs for purposes of eligibility for loan forgiveness under the Federal Direct Loan program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 2591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate overpayments of tax as contributions and to make additional contributions to the Homeless Veterans Assistance Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 2592. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to publish on the website of the Commission documents to be voted on by the Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 2593. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require identification and description on the website of the Federal Communications Commission of items to be decided on authority delegated by the Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 2594. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to ensure that the receipt of certain loans provided by the Small Business Administration does not violate the prohibition against receiving duplicative financial assistance in the case of a disaster; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2595. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a nationally significant Federal lands and tribal projects program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 2596. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California):

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to promote health care technology innovation and access to medical devices and services for which patients choose to self-pay under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; 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 Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 2598. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish requirements relating to marijuana-impaired driving, to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to issue comprehensive guidance on the best practices to prevent marijuana-impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2599. A bill to prohibit the obligation of certain funds until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency withdraws the rule relating to the definition of "waters of the United States"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, 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. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. GRAYSON):

H.R. 2600. A bill to address the concept of "Too Big To Fail" with respect to certain financial entities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 2601. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a pilot program to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H. Res. 286. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that investing in the Nation's skilled workforce is investing in the nation's economy, and that in accordance with existing law, the House of Representatives should promote public and private partnerships to increase training programs, tax incentives, industry and State apprenticeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. CHABOT:

H.R. 2584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 2585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 2586.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 2587.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ALLEN:
H.R. 2588.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the Power . . . To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:
H.R. 2589.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;”

By Mr. GIBSON:
H.R. 2590.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 2591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:
H.R. 2592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 2593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: Congress shall have the Power . . . “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. MACARTHUR:
H.R. 2594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The General Welfare Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1) and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18)

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:
H.R. 2596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that “Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States”; “. . . to raise and support armies . . .”; “To provide and maintain a Navy”; “To make Rules for the Government and

Regulation of the land and naval Forces”; and “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. PAULSEN:
H.R. 2597.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:
H.R. 2598.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ROUZER:
H.R. 2599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that “The Congress shall have Power 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 of Officer thereof”

By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 2600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. TORRES:
H.R. 2601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. FLORES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 169: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 232: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 265: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 275: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 288: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 320: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 359: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 402: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 425: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 465: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 503: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 511: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 525: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 540: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 551: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 590: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 592: Ms. BASS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 602: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 607: Mrs. TORRES and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 662: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 664: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 699: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 702: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 706: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 712: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 721: Mr. GUNTA and Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 742: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 767: Mr. KATKO, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 789: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 793: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 815: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 825: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 835: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 842: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COOK, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 855: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 879: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 921: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 932: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 952: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 953: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 985: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 986: Mr. POSEY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 995: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 997: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1027: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1057: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1062: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1073: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1089: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1101: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1142: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1178: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. LONG, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1185: Mr. JOYCE, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1190: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1202: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1210: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1247: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 1270: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1275: Mr. BEYER and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1276: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1278: Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1283: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1288: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1299: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1301: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1308: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1310: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1321: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1336: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1338: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1340: Mr. REED, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1343: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1344: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1369: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1375: Mr. DOLD, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1389: Mr. GOSAR and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1413: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 1424: Mr. SHUSTER and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1439: Ms. ADAMS.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 1478: Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 1486: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 1504: Mr. HARDY.
 H.R. 1516: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1519: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. JONES, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1575: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 1599: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 1602: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1603: Mr. DOLD and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1604: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BUCK, Mr. YODER, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 1614: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1624: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 1634: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 1655: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1670: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 1718: Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 1725: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1742: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. DENT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1818: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1854: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 1877: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1899: Mr. GRAYSON and Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1900: Ms. NORTON and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 1919: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. JOLLY, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1948: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1964: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1977: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1994: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 1996: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1998: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H.R. 2009: Mr. GALLEGGO.
 H.R. 2014: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 2025: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2072: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2100: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2126: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 2140: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2152: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2191: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 2193: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 2205: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 2216: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 2233: Mr. COHEN and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 2248: Mrs. CAPPES.
 H.R. 2259: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 2272: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 2275: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2278: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2300: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 2302: Ms. FUDGE.
 H.R. 2309: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. MARINO, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 2360: Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2368: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2380: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2382: Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 2400: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2404: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2410: Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 2418: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 2450: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2461: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mrs. CAPPES.
 H.R. 2490: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 2493: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 2498: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 2500: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2510: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BLUM.
 H.R. 2516: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2523: Mr. TURNER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DENT, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 2545: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2551: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 2555: Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
 H.R. 2563: Ms. NORTON.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.J. Res. 51: Mr. LEWIS.
 H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. LUCAS.
 H. Res. 12: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. PETERS.
 H. Res. 139: Mr. DOLD.
 H. Res. 207: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 230: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Res. 279: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H. Res. 282: Mr. LANCE and Mr. HANNA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2036: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN
 AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:
 Sec. ____ (a) Each amount made available by this Act, except those amounts made available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is hereby reduced by 1 percent.
 (b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following accounts of the Department of Justice:
 (1) "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses".
 (2) "Public Safety Officer Benefits".
 (3) "United States Trustee System Fund".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA
 AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 Sec. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the legal defense of individuals who are unlawfully present in the United States.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA
 AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 Sec. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to the case State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America, et al. (No. B-14-254 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and No. 15-40238 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit).

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: Ms. BONAMICI
 AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 14, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,559,000) (increased by \$21,559,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: Ms. BONAMICI
 AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 15, lines 16, 19, and 20, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$380,000,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. ROUZER
 AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 Sec. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the State of North Carolina to implement any State law or rule that establishes or governs a logbook reporting requirement for fisherman of any kind.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. BABIN
 AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 58, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$103,700,000)".
 Page 61, lines 10 and 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$67,000,000)".

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA
 AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 Sec. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate, participate, finalize, or communicate with any other country's representatives about trade agreements that include provisions relating to visas issued under section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(L)). The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of an administration of a tax or tariff.

H.R. 2578

OFFERED BY: Ms. BONAMICI
 AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
 Sec. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice

may be used to prevent a State from implementing its own State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of industrial hemp, as defined in section 7606 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79).