

Code Talkers effectively transmitted combat messages across enemy lines to avoid interception and decryption.

Major Howard Connor said it best: "Were it not for the Navajos, the Marines would never have taken Iwo Jima."

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to highlight their contributions to Arizona and the United States.

CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is also known as CHIP, provides low-cost health insurance to nearly 9 million children all across the country, including over 25,000 children in my home State of Hawaii. Together with Medicaid, these programs have reduced the Nation's uninsured rate for children to a record low of 5 percent.

Republicans in Congress let CHIP expire back in September, jeopardizing the healthcare of millions of children.

At the current pace, my home State of Hawaii will exhaust all current CHIP funding by the end of this year, leaving thousands of our keiki unable to visit a doctor for routine checkups and to receive immunizations, prescriptions, or more.

We must act now to reauthorize this CHIP program to ensure that our children have access to the healthcare that they need. We cannot neglect those who need help the most by failing to act and reauthorize this legislation. We must act now.

WE NEED A BIPARTISAN SOLUTION TO REAUTHORIZE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this year my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have wasted months in often misguided debate over repealing the Affordable Care Act. While this debate has raged within one political party, the Children's Health Insurance Program has expired.

I received a letter last night from Governor Tom Wolf of Pennsylvania. He wants us to act to protect the hundreds of thousands of children in our Commonwealth who depend on CHIP funding to meet their basic healthcare needs.

The GOP has failed to reauthorize CHIP over arguments of how to pay for it and the distractions of a failed effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That puts us in a tough spot in Philadelphia and the Commonwealth.

I am convinced that something must be done because, as Governor Wolf points out, time is essential for our

State and numerous others; yet 300,000 kids are enrolled in CHIP, which will soon run out of money to pay for their care.

The kids who rely on CHIP funding are some of the most vulnerable in our State, and, frankly, they need action now. The solution doesn't have to be partisan. Providing low-income kids and the hospitals that serve them isn't a Democratic or Republican issue; it is a commonsense issue. The failure to act is unacceptable, so I say now we need to do something.

I urge my colleagues in the GOP to get to work on a bipartisan solution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2936, RESILIENT FEDERAL FORESTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 595 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 595

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2936) to expedite under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and improve forest management activities on National Forest System lands, on public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, and on Tribal lands to return resilience to overgrown, fire-prone forested lands, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-36. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amend-

ments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, just yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 595, providing for consideration of an important piece of legislation, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2936 under a structured rule, with four Democratic amendments made in order and two bipartisan amendments and one Republican-led amendment made in order.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017, a bill that is critically important to my district in central Washington State and to rural, forested districts like it across the United States who continue to face devastation from catastrophic wildfires as we have seen, just this last year, a great example of.

This bipartisan, comprehensive legislation is aimed at addressing the disastrous consequences of wildfires by utilizing the tools the Forest Service and other agencies have to reduce the threats posed by these wildfires, by insects, by disease infestation, and by dangerous old forest overgrowth that serves as a literal tinderbox for wildfires. This legislation will expedite and improve forest management activities in Federal forests to counteract these threats.

This legislation, spearheaded by my friend and colleague from Arkansas, Representative BRUCE WESTERMAN, who is a trained forester himself, is comprised of a truly comprehensive effort developed here in the people's House. It is bipartisan. This bipartisan support demonstrates that the threat of catastrophic wildfires does not just impact a red or a blue district, but, rather, it poses a threat to communities across the United States.

□ 1230

H.R. 2936 would provide Federal land management agencies immediate tools to increase the pace and the scale of forest management projects to dramatically improve the health and resiliency of our national forests, ensuring robust protection of the environment. Active management leads to healthier forests. It is that simple.

This legislation also allows expedited review for collaborative projects in Federal forests and removes incentives for special interest groups to file frivolous lawsuits. By requiring litigants opposing active management projects to propose an alternative management option, we can instill accountability into a system that is wrought with litigation.

Additionally, the legislation bolsters locally led forest management and hazardous fuel reduction projects to improve forest health.

By engaging local stakeholders, we can lessen the severity and the costs of wildfires, while protecting the communities and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, another major component of our Nation's wildfire crisis is the broken system with which we fund firefighting suppression. When these firefighting costs exceed the existing budget, the U.S. Forest Service transfers funds from other vital forest management program accounts in order to pay for wildfire suppression. I and a lot of other people in this Chamber have been outspoken critics of this dangerous broken cycle known as fire borrowing. That also is a very bipartisan position that is taken. H.R. 2936 provides a major step forward in ending this cycle. By raiding accounts that provide for forest management programs which help prevent wildfires, we tie one hand behind our back in an effort to both prevent and suppress these catastrophic wildfires. This legislation will help to put an end to this longstanding problem.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents know as well as anyone the immense threat that wildfires pose to local communities. In just the past 4 years, the fourth district of my State, my district, has seen the two largest fires in Washington State's history. We have lost hundreds of homes and businesses and structures. My constituents are still struggling to recover from the Carlton Complex Fire of 2014 and the Okanogan Complex Fire of 2015. We lost three firefighters that year. That truly is a high cost.

Active forest management is a matter of saving lives and livelihoods, of protecting our communities, and ensuring our constituents' health and safety, which is why I am proud to support this rule and the underlying legislation that it represents today.

Mr. Speaker, as I have often said, we cannot continue to limp from one devastating fire season to the next. We must take significant steps toward reforestation, rehabilitation, and overall forest management. This legislation

will allow us to do just that. We must begin to prevent, to suppress, to mitigate the threat of catastrophic wildfires, and the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017 will be a momentous opportunity to turn around our diseased and overgrown Federal forests. This legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the current path of forest management on public lands. It is outdated, unsustainable, and dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward rule allowing for consideration of this critical piece of legislation that will help protect our rural communities and ensure that we are prepared to respond to devastating and catastrophic wildfires that have plagued many areas of our country in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my colleague from Florida, I would like to share one last note. Just a few weeks ago, the new chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Tony Tooke, came to Capitol Hill and briefed some of my colleagues, including me, regarding this year's devastating wildfire season.

He reported to us that over 8 million acres, just this year, have burned. We have also lost dozens of lives, thousands of homes. Chief Tooke left us with the stark fact that while more than 8 million acres burned this year, another 80 million acres across the United States are at high risk of catching fire—80 million acres. Mr. Speaker, if that does not show how dire this problem is, then I certainly can't tell you what does.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before beginning my remarks, I would offer condolences to the grieving families who lost loved ones in yesterday's terrorist attack in New York City, and to have the people of New York know—and I know I speak for all of us, and there will be a more appropriate recognition at a time in the future, I am sure, but to have them know that all of us grieve with them and are concerned not only for those who lost their lives, but to assist in preventing measures of this type in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

This bill is a sweeping attack on responsible forest management policy that upends key environmental safeguards, limits public participation in land management decisions, and prioritizes commercial timber harvest over transparent, science-based management. In other words, this is business as usual for this Republican majority when it comes to protecting our environment.

A footnote right there, my friend from the State of Washington does

highlight, rightly, concerns not only for his congressional district, but areas throughout the country that have experienced wildfires.

Many of us have talked about this in conjunction with other disasters and a need for this Congress to be able to address the shortfall in funding for such important measures.

During this Congress alone, my Republican friends have brought to the floor bills that undermine the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue independent and objective scientific conclusions, weaken regulations of pesticides, and repeal rulemakings aimed at effective, science-based management of public lands, just to name a few things.

Repeatedly, my Republican friends ignore science and attack environmental protections all in an all-too-obvious attempt to help commercial interests over sound conservation policy. This focus not only undermines our public lands, but it also harms the health and safety of the American people.

This bill continues the assault on our Nation's environmental protections, and it may be one of the most irresponsible examples yet.

Under the guise of responding to the recent tragic wildfires in California and elsewhere in this Nation, this legislation attacks the National Environmental Policy Act, known as NEPA, which requires Federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their actions.

The bill also attacks the Endangered Species Act by requiring redundant and unnecessary reporting requirements. It blocks access to the courts and limits recovery in environmental justice cases. Just for good measure, this bill effectively overturns President Obama's administration's monument expansion.

The bill does little to fix the true problem of wildfire management, namely the chronic underfunding of wildfire management. Any serious proposal must address the constant funding shortages at the U.S. Forest Service by increasing the amount of Federal funding available for wildfire suppression. A successful solution needs to provide advanced access to emergency funding.

Unfortunately, today's legislation does no such thing. Yesterday, the administration offered its statement of administration policy, and, at best, it is tepid. It says, "The administration appreciates the intent of H.R. 2936 . . . and is supportive of land management reforms like those outlined in the legislation," and then comes the however. "The administration, however, has concerns about the legislation's revisions to the Stafford Act, which would force competition for funding between wildfires on Federal land and other disasters already covered by the Stafford Act, including hurricanes."

It goes on to say, ". . . the administration supports a separate, annual cap

adjustment for wildfire suppression operations, which will resolve concerns about the sufficiency of funds for wildfire suppression and avoid unnecessary competition for Stafford Act funds.”

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2936—RESILIENT FEDERAL FORESTS ACT OF 2017—REP. WESTERMAN R-AR, AND COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly believes that funding for wildland fire management must be addressed in order to enable the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to better manage the Nation's forests and other public lands. The Administration's second disaster funding request, submitted to Congress on October 4, 2017, underscored this belief. The request also noted the Administration's belief that land management reforms are critical to solving the problem of “fire borrowing”—taking funds from forest management programs to cover fire costs that exceed appropriations—in a comprehensive manner, rather than through a funding-only appropriations approach.

The Administration appreciates the intent of H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017, and is supportive of land management reforms like those outlined in the legislation. The Administration, however, has concerns about the legislation's revisions to the Stafford Act, which would force competition for funding between wildfires on Federal land and other disasters already covered by the Stafford Act, including hurricanes.

Wildland Fire Management Funding

Last year, Federal wildfire suppression spending reached \$2.9 billion, an amount that signals clearly the need for Congress to address the rising cost of fire suppression operations. The dependence on “fire borrowing” to cover funding shortfalls in times of severe wildfire impedes the missions of our land management agencies, including by taking critical funding from programs that help reduce the risk of catastrophic fire, restore and maintain healthy functioning ecosystems, and yield timber production.

The Administration, however, has concerns with re-purposing the Stafford Act to address wildfires. The purpose of the Stafford Act is to assist State, local, tribal, and territorial (SLTT) governments that become overwhelmed when responding to and recovering from natural disasters affecting their jurisdictions. H.R. 2936 would modify the Stafford Act by creating a new type of disaster declaration to address the cost of wildfire suppression on Federal land, thereby changing long-standing principles governing Federal support to SLTT governments. As we have seen in this year's historic Atlantic hurricane season, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) must continue to be focused on its existing mission, and the Stafford Act's Disaster Relief Fund must remain dedicated solely to that mission.

Instead of the approach outlined in H.R. 2936, the Administration supports a separate, annual cap adjustment for wildfire suppression operations, which will resolve concerns about the sufficiency of funds for wildfire suppression and avoid unnecessary competition for Stafford Act funds.

Improving Forest Management

The Administration appreciates H.R. 2936's recognition that fixing the funding component of fire borrowing will not, on its own, stop the worsening trend of catastrophic wildfires. Meaningful forest management reforms to strengthen our ability to restore the Nation's forests and improve their resili-

ence to destructive wildfires must be a part of any permanent solution. H.R. 2936's provisions that expedite environmental approval for proactive forest management, including hazardous fuel reduction and post-fire timber salvage and reforestation actions, are important steps forward. The Administration supports and will continue to work with Congress on the details of the forest management reform proposals.

Although the Administration has concerns with H.R. 2936's modifications to the Stafford Act, the Administration will continue working with Congress to enact a sustainable solution to “fire borrowing” that does not adversely affect FEMA's critical disaster relief funding and that recognizes the need for a comprehensive solution to the problem of wildfires.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the bill does little to fix the true problem of wildfire management. Any serious proposal, as I have said, must address the constant funding shortages, and that is what, among other things, the administration suggested.

Mr. Speaker, this year has been a wake-up call. We must do more to respond to the natural disasters that face our Nation. After three major hurricanes and devastating wildfires in my friend from Washington's State, in California, in Montana, and even in the Everglades of Florida we have experienced some wildfires, albeit not at the magnitude of loss of life or property as existed in some of the others, our resources and agencies are stretched to the brink.

Weeks after the storms, millions of people across the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are without power and without reliable access to clean drinking water. FEMA Administrator Brock Long testified just yesterday that the response to these storms and wildfires and other disasters—we have had tornadoes that have come along as well—is costing the Federal Government \$200 million a day.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Office of Management and Budget is currently working to send a proposal to Congress for a third supplemental spending package to address the recovery needs in the affected areas. I urge them and my colleagues here in Congress to act swiftly to provide the resources that so many people desperately need. In the meantime, what have we gotten from Republicans? Bipartisanship? Sound science-based proposals? No. Instead, the Republican majority has ignored bipartisanship, and, yesterday, in the Rules Committee, a bipartisan measure was offered that was a thoughtful proposal on this topic, and was rejected, and presented this bill that we have here now that doesn't address the real issues facing public land and wildfire management, but, rather, guts environmental protection and overturns President Obama's monument expansion.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, this is business as usual for House Republicans. But if we are going to seriously address natural dis-

asters and how we respond to them, I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to put aside their partisanship, reconsider their denial of climate change and its effects on our environment, and join Democrats in working together to address this and other important issues faced by all Americans.

There were two amendments that were offered yesterday by my colleagues from California. Both of those amendments were not made in order. I don't think it is right when people offer legislation, particularly those that have just been damaged, as our colleagues, Congressmen Thompson and Matsui, and others in the northern California region. They at least should have had an opportunity to offer up their amendment and have it voted against if people felt so here in this body.

I would hope, in the future, we would make a correction of that kind of undertaking. I would hope all Members of this body would have an opportunity to present their ideas on any legislation, and something as important as this could have allowed for an open rule, rather than for partisan activity to reign supreme.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the admonition of my friend from Florida, that to bring bipartisan proposals forward, this absolutely is a bipartisan bill; support from both sides of the aisle, because, as I said in my opening comments, these kind of fires know no political boundaries, know no political lines. So I am very happy to report that we have a strong bipartisan effort right here in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017.

I do thank the gentleman from Washington State for this time. I urge all Members, Republicans and Democrats, to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus my remarks on one specific and very important section of the underlying bill. This pertains to allowing young men and young women the opportunity to work and to learn the family trade of logging.

Now, logging is a very big business in the State of Maine. About 90 percent of our State, Mr. Speaker, is forested, and we have generations and traditions of logging in the State of Maine. Logging is often a family-run business where the practice and the technique of harvesting and then transporting saw logs to mills are passed down from one generation to another.

Now, H.R. 2936 brings Federal regulations in line with this new technology and new standards of safety by allowing family-owned logging businesses

the ability to train 16- and 17-year-olds under very close supervision of their parents.

We need to make certain, Mr. Speaker, that the next generation of loggers are able to learn what they need to know, how to run these family-run businesses, including the operation and maintenance of their equipment. We do this, please, by supporting the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that the long-term health of the logging business industry is supported and can continue from one generation to another.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I might add, attendant to this, on yesterday, my colleagues, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, CARLOS CURBELO, FREDERICA WILSON, and myself, introduced legislation calling for giving 300,000 migrants in this country, from a variety of countries, an opportunity for permanent residence—those from El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), my good friend, to speak to the issue that I just talked about, the Dream Act.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it has been 57 days since the President abruptly and irresponsibly terminated the DACA program.

For 57 days, students have been panicked about how much longer they can go to school. Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters, are terrified that they might lose their loved ones any minute. Parents are afraid to take their children to the hospital or to school, and breadwinners don't know whether they will be able to continue to earn a paycheck to support themselves and their families.

For 57 days, the Republican-controlled Congress has been silent, doing nothing to provide certainty for 800,000 American DREAMers who are caught up in Congressional dysfunction. Without a permanent legislative fix, these young Americans, like Maritza from Texas, will be at risk of detention and deportation.

Maritza works part time to help her pay for college so she can pursue her dream career in journalism after graduation. Over months, she and her fam-

ily saved up \$1,000 to pay for an attorney and the DACA program application fee. All she needed was her school to provide her records so she could finish her application.

But then Hurricane Harvey hit and flooded her family's home in east Houston and shut down school for 2 weeks. While Maritza and her mother were recovering from Harvey's devastation, they were the victims of another disaster, but this one was created by their own government.

They watched Attorney General Jeff Sessions announce on live TV that the Trump administration was ending DACA and cutting off new applications for young immigrants just like her. The devastating news crushed Maritza and her family. Now they and countless others have waited 57 days for us to fix it.

Today we have the opportunity to uphold our values and to pass the Dream Act so that these young Americans aren't waiting in fear any longer.

Mr. Speaker, there is a quote directly above your chair from Daniel Webster imploring us to do "something worthy to be remembered."

So how will we be remembered? Will the Republican-controlled Congress continue to sit here and passively accept the Trump administration's cowardly decision to eliminate protections for countless DREAMers across the country? Or do we want to do something about it?

We have an opportunity to protect our neighbors, coworkers, classmates, friends, constituents, and members of our military who have done everything to try to contribute to this great country. One vote would change the lives of nearly 800,000 Americans forever. One vote would allow them to pursue the American Dream, to go to school, to continue to work, to buy a house, or to start a business.

Mr. Speaker, isn't that why we were sent here? Wouldn't that be something worthy to be remembered?

I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and provide certainty for Americans like Maritza, who want to continue to work, learn, and live in the country that they love, the only country they have ever known. We cannot afford to wait another day.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we do deal with a lot of important issues on this floor. Today we are talking about something that, in this country, people are losing property, we are losing our natural resources, and, certainly, people are losing their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) to talk further on this important topic.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the bill for which it was made, the Resilient Federal Forests Act. The rule makes in order several needed amendments, but, more importantly, it allows for much-needed

debate and consideration of a bipartisan bill to address the growing economic and environmental threats posed by catastrophic wildfires.

This bill will give Federal agencies immediate tools to increase the effectiveness of our forest management projects while preserving environmental protections.

While of immense benefit to preserving our national parks, the bill also supports the private sector by addressing obstructionist litigation against management activity, and rewarding collaboration by local governments and local stakeholders when they work together to foster more effective management projects.

Mr. Speaker, North Carolina's Fifth District is home to pristine national parks, including the scenic Blue Ridge Parkway, otherwise known as America's favorite drive.

I am an unwavering supporter of our Nation's national parks, and I look forward to equipping better our park managers to protect our forests from wildfires and other threats to their environmental integrity.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, through you, I would advise my good friend from Washington that I have no further speakers and I will be prepared to close whenever he is. Until such time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the prime sponsor of the bill in question today.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for not only yielding me this time and for his good work on the Rules Committee, but for his support of my bill, H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak right now not only as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, but also as a forester, educated at this country's first forestry school, licensed by my home State by exam to practice forestry. If there is an issue that I understand that comes before this Congress, it is our forests.

As I listen to accusations from across the aisle, I trust my colleagues are not intentionally trying to mislead, but they seem to know so much about just what isn't so. This is a bipartisan bill with Democratic cosponsors and it is based on sound scientific management.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the floor today to debate a rule and, as you know, this rule is part of the process of the House of Representatives that will conclude later this afternoon with votes not only on this rule, but eventually on the underlying legislation.

The process of moving this bill through the House began earlier this year, as I and a number of Members representing multiple committees talked about and debated different ideas and what we hoped for in a final piece of legislation. After hundreds of meetings with stakeholders on all sides of this issue, on both sides of the aisle,

and countless hours of work by Members and staff alike, I believe that the House stands ready to vote to improve the condition of our national forest land.

However, the hard work of everyone involved will be for naught if the Senate fails to act. For that reason, I encourage our colleagues in the Senate to take up this legislation, debate it, offer solutions, and act to make a difference on our national forests and our rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. Our national forests are in the poorest condition this Nation has ever seen, and will continue to degrade if we fail to act and complete the work that has started here. However, I believe that we have reason to be encouraged. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee recently held a hearing on a discussion draft that includes similar forest management provisions as H.R. 2936, and I know the other committees of jurisdiction are working on forest reform legislation as well.

□ 1300

This is not only a forest health issue; it is a public health issue that demands action. Shame on us if we continue to stand idly by and watch our treasured national forests go up in smoke while people suffer and die. I stand here today to encourage the House to adopt this rule and pass this bill, therefore allowing the United States Senate to take up the legislation, or, at the very least, something similar to it. Pass it and allow us to meet at conference and work out the differences. Let us present a workable solution to the President for his signature.

This year, more than 8.8 million acres of wildfire burned, as has been pointed out, and there is an additional 80 million acres on the verge of spawning more catastrophic wildfires. How many more acres must burn? How many more lives must be lost?

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, how many more dreams will be ruined before we come together to address this critical issue?

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Rules Committee, as well as Mr. WESTERMAN, for their work on this bill.

I rise in support, Mr. Speaker, of the rule for consideration of H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, a bill that will help address the wildfire crisis that is plaguing our Nation as well as begin the very important process of restoring the health of our forests.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this has been one of the largest wildfire years in

our Nation's history. We have seen livelihoods across the West threatened and seen the lives of our brave firefighters put in harm's way. These fires are deadly, and, tragically, more than 40 people lost their lives when fast-moving wildfires swept through northern California just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, we have particularly felt the effects in my State of Wyoming, where we find ourselves in an absolutely indefensible situation. Fires are being caused and worsened by Federal mismanagement. Eight years of Federal policy opposing proven methods of forest management and, instead, focusing on efforts to prevent all human use of our forests have done significant damage.

This damage is not just to the forests that we have had to watch burn, Mr. Speaker, but we have also seen tremendous damage to our water in postfire situations where the water is contaminated with ash; significant damage to wildlife habitat, the health of our forests, to property, and, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, to human life.

Under the bad policies and the mismanagement from the Federal Government, we have seen our forests become overgrown, accumulating unsafe levels of hazardous biofuels that have become an absolute tinderbox for these fires. We must take action now.

This bill, as my colleagues have pointed out, is a bipartisan effort to begin to take the steps we know will help reduce hazardous fuels and improve the management of our forests. We must also act, Mr. Speaker, as a Congress, to fix the fire-borrowing issue. The Resilient Federal Forests Act takes a significant step toward ending the practice of fire borrowing, and simplifies the process for implementing proper, effective forest management strategies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge, therefore, the adoption of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to demonstrate the importance of this particular piece of legislation to the whole country.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017. This bill is a commonsense, thoughtful approach to restore our forests and minimize forest fire risk.

First and foremost, I thank Representative WESTERMAN for understanding the need for these vital reforms. He has been a great partner to work with and has a keen understanding of how to restore our forests.

This bill contains a number of needed reforms, but, in particular, H.R. 2936 will put an end to obstructionist litigation that has been paralyzing the abil-

ity of the Forest Service to manage their own land for years.

The legislation creates an arbitration pilot program that requires anyone suing to block a forest management activity to produce an alternative solution, providing effective resolutions to problems rather than frivolous litigant activity. The bill also puts a limit on the amount of taxpayer dollars that can go to pay legal fees of obstructionist groups when they sue to stop management.

It seems that every year we have a longer, more devastating fire season. In my home State of California this year, it has been particularly devastating in both lives and land lost. These fires demand that we act, and we need to act now, to fix our forest management.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

One last thing: Go Dodgers.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, most all Western States were impacted in one way or another by catastrophic fires this summer. Particularly hard hit was the great State of Oregon.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Rules Committee, my colleague from across the river in Washington State. My apologies to Washingtonians because one of our fires, the Eagle Creek fire, actually spotted across the mighty Columbia River, set fire to part of the forests in Washington State down near Stevenson. Fortunately, that fire was extinguished. The one on the Oregon side was terribly dangerous, man-caused, human-caused. It blew out 14 miles in one night headed toward Portland.

These are monster fires. We lost 678,000 acres this year to forest fires in my great State of Oregon. It is about two-thirds of the entire size of the State of Rhode Island. It is enormous. This is happening year after year, and the consequences are extraordinary.

Smoke chokes our airsheds. Schools literally had to shut down and send kids home because it was too smoky to have them inside the school. The 30th anniversary of Cycle Oregon was canceled. That is a major annual bicycle ride that occurs; 30 years, the 30th anniversary, canceled. They couldn't find a way to pull it off. The Shakespeare Festival down in Ashland, nine performances had to be canceled; \$400,000, Mr. Speaker, just in ticket receipts that had to be foregone. I am told they had to lay off people as a result.

When you think about not only the lost forests—this is what a forest looks like after it is burned—the ground is often sterilized. You can't even go back and replant for a year or two in some cases because there is no soil left.

The impacts are enormous on our environment. Those of us who are concerned about the environment, about carbon emissions into the atmosphere,

in 2015, when a like amount was burned in Oregon, the Forest Service estimated the blazes emitted more than 90,000 tons of fine particulates and 14.2 million tons of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. That is equivalent to more than 3 million cars; 3 million cars.

The cause of these increasingly catastrophic fires, as Dr. John Bailey of the Oregon State University's College of Forestry pointed out during a hearing earlier this month in our Energy and Commerce Committee, in some cases, the forest landscapes in my part of Oregon, eastern Oregon that would have historically held about 20 trees per acre, have more than 1,000 trees growing there today.

You see, we have stopped management. In many cases, we have stopped fire. The forests continue to grow, and die, and build, and get more dense, and so when fire does strike, it is with devastating consequence.

My friend from Florida, and he is my friend, when he gets thunderstorms in Florida in the summer, he gets a lot of rain with it, I bet. If we have thunderstorms in Oregon, we don't get the rain. We went nearly 90 days without any rain, but we still got lightning. The lightning torches these forests and starts a lot of these blazes.

A 2014 study in California by the Nature Conservancy, Forest Service, and others found that these types of projects can reduce the intensity of fires up to 70 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Poe of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. My intensity of this issue is almost that of the fires we fight.

We can reduce the size and intensity of fires by 70 percent if we do the kinds of projects that thin out the forest, better manage, and be better stewards of our public Federal forests that are contemplated as a result of this legislation.

In Oregon, this bill would take away an arbitrary prohibition on harvesting trees over 21 inches in diameter that has tied the hands of our forest managers. We would clarify timber production mandates of the unique Oregon-California lands in southern and western Oregon to live with the underlying statute and actually have it enforced.

When fires do happen, we would exchange this for a new, healthy forest that would grow green trees that sequester carbon and restore a landscape that we in the West so enjoy.

It is long past time to fix our broken forest policy. I commend the Rules Committee for bringing this bill forward, and I commend Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, and others who have worked on this on both sides of the aisle to help us stop the fires that ravage, and kill, and destroy, and to help us have healthy, green forests.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his passionate words about the impact of catastrophic fires in his State.

He is right. The fire from Oregon did jump the Columbia River into Washington, but that is not the only thing that they shared with us this summer. My own community, the Yakima Valley, was filled with smoke for probably 6 weeks this summer, causing all kinds of health issues for the citizens of central Washington, not just from Oregon, but smoke also from as far away as Montana and Idaho, and other parts of the Northwest.

In fact, I was just handed a news article, I would like to note, from the Methow Valley News, which if you have never been to the Methow Valley, it is one of the most pristine, beautiful places on the face of the Earth. They are talking about the quality of air in the Methow Valley in the community of Twisp.

The air pollution in Twisp, Washington, is considered among the worst in the State, if you can imagine that, in some of the most beautiful, clean, pristine areas that you can imagine. The air quality, largely due to these catastrophic fires year round, has been impacted negatively. That is something that, thanks to the Methow Valley News, they are making very clear to all of us that we need to do something to address this particularly important issue.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), my neighbor to the east, the Congressperson from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Washington.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this very important issue.

I am pleased to see this legislation, the Resilient Federal Forests Act coming to the floor today. I also want to express appreciation to Representative WESTERMAN for his leadership through the years on this issue. In recent years, in my home State, as has been mentioned, in Washington State, we have seen larger and larger devastating wildfires, breaking all of the records, and it seems like every year they just get larger and larger, and more devastating.

They impact people's health. It is not unusual now for air quality warnings to be in eastern Washington, not just for days, but weeks at end, where it really does impact people's health. It jeopardizes our safety—the stories of people who are caught in the midst of these fires—and it is destroying our environment.

We like to think of our forests as being green and healthy stands of trees, but, unfortunately, today, when you look at these forests, millions of acres, millions and millions of acres within the U.S. Forest Service are actually diseased, dying, bug-infested trees.

I had the opportunity to meet with the chief of the Forest Service just last week, and he said that he estimated 80 million out of the 198 million acres that the U.S. Forest Service owns needs treatment.

The Forest Service has warned us for years that the forests are in terrible shape. It is really a result of decades of overregulation and frivolous lawsuits that have hindered forest management, and we are paying the price.

I represent the Colville National Forest which is about a million-acre forest. It is really the engine of our economy in the Northwest. Because what happens in the Colville National Forest determines whether or not we have Vaagen Brothers Lumber, or 49 Degrees North Ski & Snowboard Resort, or the biomass facility that Avista runs, converting wood waste into electricity.

This is all providing jobs, energy, recreational opportunities, yet mills have been closed, and jobs have been lost. It is unacceptable. It is time to pass the Resilient Federal Forests Act legislation.

□ 1315

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good gentlewoman from Washington State for her remarks.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly show this is an example of some of the fire damage. If you can see that, this is from the Carlton Complex Fire that happened 3 years ago in my district in central Washington, taken just yesterday.

The Carlton Complex burned through State, private, and Federal lands. So you can see that these dead, fire-damaged trees have not been logged, they have not been removed, and what they do is provide the kindling for the next catastrophic fire.

So that is what we are talking about here, not disarming local communities but actually arming them and giving them the ability and the tools that they need in order to prevent these catastrophic fires.

I would invite the good gentleman from Florida to come with me to witness firsthand the devastation and the potential devastation that we have and to really understand the nature of the issue. I would reciprocate with a visit to his State to see the damage done by the devastating hurricanes as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend that I am prepared to close. I have no additional speakers, and I will go forward with your permission.

In the wake of the worst wildfires, as have been mentioned here by so many

of our colleagues, that the U.S. has experienced in quite a while, House Republicans, however, have responded by bringing to the floor, really, a tired bill passed last Congress that went nowhere in the Senate, a bill that does not fix the true problem of chronically underfunding wildfire prevention but, instead, doubles down in creating an unworkable system for wildfire suppression funding, a bill that rolls back environmental protection and limits access to the courts.

It is dismaying to see the response to natural disasters in this country hinge on the same thing so many other important debates do: partisanship and ignoring facts and science.

Despite a year in which we have seen historic hurricanes and wildfires, my Republican colleagues have yet again resorted to continuing to push policies that repeal environmental regulations, all the while denying the effects climate change is having on our communities and our country's economy.

My friend from Oregon, a moment ago—and he is my friend—spoke about the thunderstorms that we receive in Florida. In his version, it is accompanied by rain, and that is true a lot. But we, too, have droughts in Florida, and Florida is known as the lightning capital of the world. Very occasionally, particularly in central Florida and in the Everglades, those lightning strikes produce wildfires in the congressional district that I serve and many others. Our response to these events needs to improve, and it needs to happen quickly.

These disasters do not recognize congressional districts. These disasters do not target one area of our country over another and do not care about Republican or Democratic partisan gamesmanship. If we are going to adequately respond to the needs of millions of American citizens in the wake of these and future storms and future wildfires, we need to be advocating for sound policies based on science. This is the only way to protect future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule and the underlying legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the newspaper article from the Methow Valley News, dated October 27.

[From the Methow Valley News, Oct. 27, 2017]
SMOKE IS A YEAR-ROUND PROBLEM IN THE VALLEY

(By Ann McCreary)

Autumn in the Methow Valley brings cool, crisp weather, bright days and colorful foliage. And smoke. Just like every other season of the year.

The Methow Valley's clean, clear air—one of its key attractions—is anything but clean and clear for extended periods of the year. In fact, the Methow Valley has four seasons of smoke, said Liz Walker, head of the Methow Valley Clean Air Project.

And it is not insignificant amounts of smoke, Walker said. Air pollution in Twisp is among the worst in the state, based on data

from the Washington Department of Ecology.

Each season in the Methow Valley brings its own source of air pollution. In recent years, the all-too-familiar pall of wildfire smoke has hung over the valley for days or weeks during summer. As wildfires are put out by cooler, wet weather of fall, the valley enters another phase of smoke produced by prescribed burning in national forests, outdoor burn piles and wood stoves for home heating.

In spring, prescribed burning begins again, as well as more burn piles. “Maybe a respite in June and early July, and then wildfire season will be upon us,” Walker said.

Although wildfire season can bring health-threatening amounts of smoke to the valley, like last summer's Diamond Creek Fire, poor air quality is a real concern in winter as well, Walker said. “We're susceptible to inversions and stagnation in the winter months” that trap wood stove smoke on the valley floor, she said.

Smoke is the air pollutant of greatest concern in the Methow Valley, and is monitored by the Department of Ecology. It is known as PM2.5, which means particulate matter that is 2.5 microns or smaller. These tiny particles are most frequently caused by incomplete combustion, and can stay airborne and can travel long distances, increasing the likelihood that humans and animals will inhale them.

Data collected by a Department of Ecology air monitor in Twisp ranked air quality at that site among the eight most-polluted places in the state in 2016, Walker said. “By several of the measures the Department of Ecology uses to look at PM2.5 pollution reported at air quality monitors across the state, Twisp ranks among the worst in air pollution—worse than metro Seattle or Tacoma. This is even after PM2.5 from wildfire smoke is subtracted out,” Walker said.

There was insufficient data from the air pollution monitor in Winthrop to assess air quality there last year, “but it is typically only slightly better than Twisp,” Walker said.

PUBLIC COST

“Our valley cares a lot about this, and we're working together to improve it. There's a real public health cost to air pollution. Anyone who has sat around a campfire, or gone for a strenuous hike on a smoky day has had a firsthand lesson in the toxicity of smoke,” Walker said.

Walker's concern about health impacts come from her training as an environmental health toxicologist. Harmful effects range from the inability to exercise outdoors, to respiratory distress and infections, to increased risk of cancer.

“For vulnerable populations—babies, children, pregnant women, elders, and anyone with heart or lung issues—bad air days can mean serious health repercussions. For everyone, chronic exposure to high levels of PM2.5 can potentially trigger or exacerbate conditions such as headaches, asthma, bronchitis and cardiovascular disease.”

There are economic costs of air pollution in the Methow Valley as well, she said. “We're a tourist economy, dependent on the natural beauty of the valley,” Walker said.

The Methow Valley Clean Air Project was launched in 2015 by Raleigh Bowden, a local physician, after she saw people suffering health effects of poor winter air quality, Walker said. A key goal of the project is improving air quality during the home heating season, October through March.

“Due to our valley's frequent winter inversions, smoke from woodstoves and outdoor burning pollutes our air to frequently unhealthy levels,” Walker said. “We've fo-

cused on the home heating season because this is when we can make behavioral changes to improve our air quality. This is a controllable source of pollution, as contrasted with pollution from wildfires.”

The Clean Air Project outlines measures residents can take to reduce pollution from wood stoves, including: Properly season wood so that it is dry and burns cleaner; clean chimneys yearly; build small, hot fires and don't damp them down; comply with burn bans; upgrade to certified stoves or a wood-burning alternative; weatherize homes.

The organization is also working to reduce outdoor burning of yard waste and provide alternatives, including “vegetation drives” sponsored by the Clean Air Project, Walker said.

SUCCESSFUL DRIVES

Vegetation drives, supported by grants and partnerships, were held in the fall of 2016 and spring of 2017, and another drive is scheduled next spring. Past drives have collected about 20 tons of vegetation, which prevented hundreds or thousands of hours of smoke, Walker said.

The yard waste was dropped off by residents and hauled to the county landfill during the first drive, conducted over two days. During the second drive, conducted over eight days in partnership with the Town of Twisp, residents delivered vegetation to a site near the Twisp wastewater treatment plant, where it was chipped and offered free for landscaping and mulching.

“The most unusual community participant brought his load strapped to the back of his bicycle—now that's commitment to clean air!” Walker said.

The Clean Air Project also partnered this year with the Pine Forest Homeowners Association to provide support for chipping branches and slash created when underbrush and trees were thinned and limbed as part of Pine Forest's ongoing Firewise efforts. The debris would otherwise have been burned.

Next spring's vegetation drive will be conducted in partnership with the Okanogan Conservation District, Walker said. She suggested that residents who have been accumulating yard waste cover their piles this fall instead of burning them, and haul them to the vegetation drive in the spring to be chipped.

Walker acknowledged that it takes extra effort, and a different mindset, to participate in a vegetation drive rather than burn yard waste. “It's hard. Our valley is long. It requires a truck, loading it up and hauling it in,” she said. “People have been outdoor burning in the valley forever. It's how you get rid of your stuff when you live out in the country.”

However, Walker said, many valley residents have been supportive of the vegetation drives. “People really appreciate this as an option. They don't want to impact the health of families and the community,” she said.

For people who want to continue the longstanding local tradition of burning yard waste, the Clean Air Project suggests “best practices for burning outdoors in the most safe and clean way,” Walker said.

“Make sure the pile is as bone dry as possible. Make sure you know what is a good day, with good ventilation, but not too much wind. We've interacted with Fire District 6 and smokejumpers. There are lots of folks with tons of knowledge about how to build a hot, clean pile,” she said.

The Clean Air Project is overseen by a volunteer advisory group. The Methow Valley Citizens' Council is fiscal sponsor for the organization. More information is available on the Methow Valley Clean Air Project Facebook page.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Florida for today's debate.

The issue of proactive management of our Nation's Federal forests is critically important to the future and economic well-being of our whole country as well as to the health of our Federal lands and safety of our rural communities.

Let me say that, if you have never been through a rural community that has had to face the devastation of a catastrophic fire, you are welcome to come to the State of Washington and see firsthand exactly the kind of damage that these fires can do.

This is of the highest priority, and I urge all my colleagues to support this rule as well as the underlying bill in order to combat these catastrophic wildfires and reform the way in which we manage our forests.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017. This is bipartisan, it is comprehensive, and it aims at addressing the disastrous consequences of catastrophic wildfires by utilizing the tools the Forest Service and other agencies have to reduce the threats posed by these fires, by insects, by disease infestation, and by dangerous old forest overgrowth.

As I said, my district in central Washington and millions of acres across our great country continue to face this threat. We must take steps to prevent and address these fires, which this bill will do by reforming the way we prepare for, respond to, and fund wildfire response and mitigation efforts. These threats will only continue to worsen not only for my constituents, but for people all around the country.

We are recognizing sustained drought conditions. Mismanagement and failure to conduct maintenance of our forests on Federal lands will continue to plague this issue. The underlying legislation is essential and desperately needed to change the outdated, unsustainable, and untimely dangerous system of Federal forest management on these lands.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward rule allowing for consideration of a critical piece of legislation that will help protect our rural communities and ensure we are prepared to respond to these devastating, catastrophic fires.

I appreciate the discussion we have had today. I believe that this is a critical measure, and I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 595 and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 595 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same re-

sult may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

YEAS—232

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Chabot | Flores |
| Aderholt | Cheney | Fortenberry |
| Allen | Coffman | Fox |
| Amash | Cole | Franks (AZ) |
| Amodel | Collins (GA) | Frelinghuysen |
| Arrington | Collins (NY) | Gaetz |
| Babin | Comer | Gallagher |
| Bacon | Comstock | Garrett |
| Banks (IN) | Conaway | Gianforte |
| Barletta | Cook | Gibbs |
| Barr | Costello (PA) | Gohmert |
| Barton | Cramer | Goodlatte |
| Bergman | Crawford | Gosar |
| Biggs | Culberson | Gowdy |
| Bilirakis | Curbelo (FL) | Granger |
| Bishop (MI) | Davidson | Graves (GA) |
| Bishop (UT) | Davis, Rodney | Graves (LA) |
| Black | Denham | Graves (MO) |
| Blackburn | Dent | Griffith |
| Blum | DeSantis | Grothman |
| Bost | Diaz-Balart | Guthrie |
| Brady (TX) | Donovan | Handel |
| Brat | Duffy | Harper |
| Brooks (IN) | Duncan (SC) | Harris |
| Buchanan | Duncan (TN) | Hartzer |
| Buck | Dunn | Hensarling |
| Bucshon | Emmer | Herrera Beutler |
| Budd | Estes (KS) | Hice, Jody B. |
| Burgess | Farenthold | Higgins (LA) |
| Byrne | Faso | Holding |
| Calvert | Ferguson | Hollingsworth |
| Carter (GA) | Fitzpatrick | Hudson |
| Carter (TX) | Fleischmann | Huizenga |

Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

NAYS—184

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff

Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)

Barragán
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Clyburn
Cummings
DeGette

Soto
Speier
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas

NOT VOTING—16

DesJarlais
Garamendi
Gomez
Hill
Jackson Lee
Nadler

□ 1345

Messrs. BROWN of Maryland and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 232, noes 184, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amdede
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Constock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford

Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Granforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler

Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert

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

Renacci
Rice (SC)
Robby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker

NOES—184

Gallego
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal

Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Kihuen
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Barragán | DeGette | Perry |
| Bridenstine | DesJarlais | Pocan |
| Brooks (AL) | Garamendi | Polis |
| Clyburn | Gomez | Smith (NE) |
| Collins (NY) | Hill | |
| Cummings | Nadler | |

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on November 1, 2017, at 11:44 a.m.:

Appointments:
Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1353

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall No. 592, and "Yea" on rollcall No. 593.

MAKING IN ORDER

CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 599

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Res. 599 in the House, if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the resolution be considered as read; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California and Representative KHANNA of California or their respective designees; and that notwithstanding any previous order of the House, the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. 1546, shall not apply to H. Con. Res. 81.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained with constituents when rollcall vote No. 592 was cast on the floor of the House, the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 1, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following mes-

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

ENCOURAGING PUBLIC OFFERINGS ACT OF 2017

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3903) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to expand the ability to use testing the waters and confidential draft registration submissions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3903

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 "Encouraging Public Offerings Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING TESTING THE WATERS AND CONFIDENTIAL SUBMISSIONS.

The Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 5(d)—

(A) by striking "Notwithstanding" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding";

(B) by striking "an emerging growth company or any person authorized to act on behalf of an emerging growth company" and inserting "an issuer or any person authorized to act on behalf of an issuer"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the engaging in oral or written communications described under paragraph (1) by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

"(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking.";

(2) in section 6(e)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "EMERGING GROWTH COMPANIES" and inserting "DRAFT REGISTRATION STATEMENTS";

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

"(1) PRIOR TO INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING.—Any issuer, prior to its initial public offering date, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for

confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

"(2) WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING OR EXCHANGE REGISTRATION.—Any issuer, within the one-year period following its initial public offering or its registration of a security under section 12(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, may confidentially submit to the Commission a draft registration statement, for confidential nonpublic review by the staff of the Commission prior to public filing, provided that the initial confidential submission and all amendments thereto shall be publicly filed with the Commission not later than 15 days before the date on which the issuer conducts a road show (as defined under section 230.433(h)(4) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) or, in the absence of a road show, at least 15 days prior to the requested effective date of the registration statement.

"(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue regulations, subject to public notice and comment, to impose such other terms, conditions, or requirements on the submission of draft registration statements described under this subsection by an issuer other than an emerging growth company as the Commission determines appropriate.

"(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Prior to any rulemaking described under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall issue a report to the Congress containing a list of the findings supporting the basis of such rulemaking."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1400

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA. 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 this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, over the last two decades, our Nation has experienced a 37 percent decline in the number of U.S. listed companies—public companies. Equally troubling, we have seen the number of publicly traded companies fall to around 5,700. These statistics are concerning because they are similar to the data we saw in the 1980s when our economy was less than half its current size.

Mr. Speaker, since 2000, the average number of initial public offerings, or IPOs, has fallen to approximately 135 per year, which pales in comparison to the more than 450 IPOs filed per year in