United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2014 No. 21

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 4, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. 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 7, 2014, 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 11:50 a.m.

POLLUTION AND CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are used to a world with gloomy news regarding the jarring impact and threats of climate change.

We are experiencing wildfires in the Pacific Northwest this winter. The snowpack is a small percentage of normal, which is not just bad news for skiers now; it means lower river levels in the spring that will affect hydropower production, irrigation for farmers, and further damage to ever-troubled fish runs. California is experiencing its worst drought in 500 years—not really manmade, as some of my Republican California colleagues claim. Although it is interesting, as pointed out in the L.A. Times yesterday in an editorial: ''Funny, isn't it, that folks who question man's ability to affect the global climate are so quick to assign human causes to the drought?''

There are severe strains on the Colorado River Basin, and 40 million people are heavily dependent on that water throughout the Southwest. Last week, we heard about the massive penguin die-off due to changing weather patterns. Of course we have been experiencing the polar vortex and wild weather this winter.

With all these bad signs, it was interesting to see a positive message emerge yesterday on the front page of The Washington Post about air pollution in China. To be sure, Chinese pollution still threatens, producing the most carbon emissions on the planet, which portend far worse climate problems in the future for everyone. It causes 1 million premature deaths a year in China and, in fact, threatens the health of west coast Americans, as we regularly breathe Chinese pollution that blows across the ocean.

It is encouraging that China is taking steps to acknowledge the problem, to track and publicize the severe pollution levels when, 5 years ago, they asked the United States Embassy in Beijing to stop publishing that same embarrassing data.

Now the Chinese Government is publishing the information itself and is even ranking the worst offenders. The 10 most polluted Chinese cities have air quality levels 6 to 10 times the pollution of the 10 worst American cities. The Chinese are providing realtime disclosure of pollution that is more ambitious than anything the United States did in the EPA's highly successful toxic release inventory that dates back almost 30 years.

It is absolutely critical that China acknowledge the problem and hold people accountable for the pollution, but it is even better news that the Chinese are going beyond mere data collection, as they unveiled a $280 billion plan to improve air quality, including limiting coal use and banning high pollution vehicles.

Isn't it ironic that the Repulbican leadership in the House of Representatives is determined to prevent the United States EPA from taking the next steps to clean up our dirty coal plants and protect us from the carbon pollution that is causing such climate disruption, all the while denying the science.

One hopes that the United States will come to its senses while it appears the Chinese are starting to come around. The future of the planet for our children and grandchildren depends upon it.

ALEXANDER MONTESSORI SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize Alexander Montessori School for 50 years of providing exceptional educational opportunities for generations of children in south Florida.

Fifty years ago, Beverly McGhee founded Alexander Day School in honor of her parents, Alice and Henry Alexander, in order to provide an early childhood facility for her two children. From the outset, her school has enjoyed a reputation as a place where kids wanted to learn and where the staff and teachers cared about what they did.

Within a few years of the school's founding, Beverly became aware of

Printed on recycled paper.

what is known as the Montessori Method. Named for Maria Montessori, her teaching philosophy was to foster in children a desire to think independently and be creative. Its environment maximizes independence and includes a strong focus on communication and self-molding for young students.

Beverly became certified as a preschool Montessori teacher and renamed her school Alexander Montessori School. She gathered teachers around her who shared her passion and dedication for providing a quality and caring Montessori environment for children, ones with only the highest standards of excellence.

From modest beginnings of that single kindergarten class, Alexander Montessori School has grown to be one of the largest and most renowned Montessori schools in the country. Today, in south Florida, Alexander Montessori School has two toddler environments, nine children's houses, and an elementary campus. These are centers where children lead the way, follow their natural talents, and fall in love with learning, an attitude summed up in its motto: ''To learn to Love to Learn.''

This independent school remains the only fully accredited American Montessori Society School in our community and one of only 10 throughout the State of Florida. I can relate to Beverly's story, her spirit, and her relentless dedication to provide children with high quality education.

I am a former Florida certified teacher and founded and was principal of a small private bilingual school in Hialeah. I know the challenges faced by our educators as well as the positive impact that an amazing teacher can have on a young mind.

I am a product of the south Florida school system. I graduated from West Miami Middle School and then Southwest Miami High School. I have an associate of arts degree from Miami/Dade College; bachelor's and master's degrees from Florida International University in education; and as an older adult, I completed a doctorate in education from the University of Miami. I am very grateful for the support that I received while I was in school, and I am certain that I would not be the same person without this support.

So ensuring that our children have the same access to a comprehensive education has become a top priority of mine. Our students deserve the best that we can offer them, and that is why I continue to work with strong partners like Alexander Montessori School to constantly improve our school system.

Education is the key to self-empowerment, and teachers like those at Alexander Montessori School are giving our students the tools they need to develop and to excel. Teachers have the power to inspire and to open whole new horizons to our youth, setting them up on a positive path with high hopes and expectations for the future.

For the professionalism and care that Beverly and everyone at Alexander Montessori School have shown in the pursuit of this most noble of professions, I thank each and every one of them. They have shaped the lives of so many students over the last 50 years, and we are truly privileged to have such wonderful individuals taking on this rewarding work in south Florida.

I thank the school again, and congratulate them on a half century of great work. Good luck in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I will now enter the names of the remarkable team members at Alexander Montessori School into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mrs. Beverley A. McGhee, Superintendent
Mr. James R. McGhee II, Headmaster
Dr. Joyce McGhee, Headmistress
Mr. Brette Rothfield, Business Manager
Ms. Anne Becton, Administrator
Mrs. Maria McGuire, teacher
Ms. Brenda Orihuela, teacher
Ms. Mirnely Borrero, teacher
Ms. Sharon Dalton, teacher
Mrs. Marta Demmer, teacher
Ms. Maria Luisa Ferro, teacher
Ms. Soraya Penate, teacher
Mrs. Grecia Perez, teacher
Mrs. Beatriz See, teacher
Mrs. Maria Teresa Vicens, teacher
Ms. Pamela Earl-Parler, teacher
Mrs. Linda Habich, teacher
Ms. Milagros Vargas, teacher
Ms. Cynthia Arboleda, teacher
Ms. Anne Becton, teacher
Mrs. Meghan Camilletti, teacher
Mrs. Melanie Carlson, teacher
Mr. Michael Depew, teacher
Mr. Stephen Falk, teacher
Ms. Lessie Fleischfresser, teacher
Mrs. Gretchen Goldstein, teacher
Ms. Ines Hanna, teacher
Mrs. Ismary Hassun, teacher
Mrs. Caroline Jacobellis, teacher
Mrs. Gail Jacobs, teacher
Mrs. Ellen Kahn, teacher
Mrs. Maria Claudia Kondrat-Libreros, teacher
Mrs. Mary Kucera, teacher
Mrs. Robbie Lukes, teacher
Mrs. Nina McClendon, teacher
Mrs. Debra Mistretta, teacher
Mrs. Colette Myers, teacher
Mrs. Patricia Pittaluga, teacher
Mrs. Cecilia Richter, teacher
Mrs. Sandra Salinas, teacher
Mrs. Janet Sanson, teacher
Mr. Samuel Steele, teacher
Mrs. Lauren Stern, teacher
Mrs. Gladys Tirse, teacher
Mrs. Virginia Vaca, teacher
Ms. Jodi Veillette, teacher
Ann Blau, Campus Secretary
Jennifer Dipolito, Accounts Payable
Gioconda Dynes, Accounts Receivable
Maria Franco, School Secretary
Odalys Fernandez, Campus Secretary
Jose Casares, Director of Maintenance
Marta Valdes, Campus Secretary
Carol Wolcott, Administrator
Cathy Rapport, Campus Director

A FAIR MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to join in the effort to pass the Fair Minimum Wage Act and raise the Federal minimum wage to $10.10 an hour.

Fifty years ago, 200,000 Americans marched on Washington. Appealing to the soul of the Nation, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his fellow speakers charted out the long journey for equality and justice ahead. In the pamphlet promoting the March on Washington, they listed 10 specific legislative demands. A number of these demands would go on to become some of the most significant achievements of the Federal Government in the postwar era: comprehensive civil rights legislation, desegregation of all school districts, an end to discrimination in Federal housing programs.

It is clear that we have made progress on many of these issues, but for many of us here, the fight for these goals remains unfinished. Let us not forget, though, that the March on Washington was actually called the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.

Let us remember number eight on that list of demands: ''A national minimum wage act that will give all Americans a decent standard of living. Government surveys show that anything less than $2 an hour fails to do this.''

On whole, the American economy has made tremendous strides in the last half century. Many in this Congress have been benefactors of that growth, but the American worker has been left behind. The $2 an hour that Dr. King and his colleagues called for would be nearly $15 per hour today when adjusted for inflation.

Despite this fact, many of my colleagues will call the demand for a $10.10 Federal minimum wage unreasonable. Many will even say this demand for a reasonable wage is rooted in partisan politics. Mr. Speaker, this reasonable demand is rooted in the belief that American workers deserve more.

President Truman said that minimum wage legislation was ''founded on the belief that full human dignity requires at least a minimum level of economic sufficiency and security.'' The call for a raise in the minimum wage is based on the fact that while a single parent making minimum wage earns $15,080 annually, that is still more than $400 below the Federal poverty rate.

The call for a raise in the minimum wage is based on the fact that working 40-hour weeks 52 weeks a year, a parent still struggles to feed their family. Think about that during your next paid vacation.

The call for a raise in the minimum wage is based on the fact that a single parent is overwhelmingly likely to be a single mother. Because, while women make up 47 percent of our workforce, they represent nearly two-thirds of minimum wage earners.

Finally, the call for a raise in the minimum wage is based on good economics. I know full well that those opposed to a raise in the minimum wage say that any raise will reduce employment, and at a certain point, it could, but a modest raise to $10 an hour is nowhere near this theoretical tipping point, and more than six dozen economists agree.

□ 1015

In a recent letter to Congress, they explicitly said:

> Increases in the minimum wage have little to no impact on the employment of minimum wage workers, even during times of weakness in the labor market.

The economic recovery has been a very long, slow road for low-wage American workers, and a raise in the minimum wage is the jolt our economy needs. Higher wages quickly turn into increased spending. Increased spending quickly turns into growth.

But minimum wage legislation, like unemployment insurance, is merely the minimum we should be doing for the American worker. Let's remember that, during the March on Washington, the demand directly preceding the call for an increase in the minimum wage was demand number 7:

> A massive Federal program to train and place . . . workers . . . on meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages.

This body needs to turn its focus on advancing legislation that will create more American jobs and policies that matter to American workers. I urge my colleagues to support the American worker. Join me in calling for jobs legislation and a reasonable raise of the Federal minimum wage.

THE PRIMACY OF STRONG AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AROUND THE GLOBE

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we deal with a lot of very important issues in this body. In fact, everybody that is going to speak this morning is going to speak about some very important issues. But I would argue that there is no issue more important that we deal with in this body than the issue of American global leadership and the issue of national defense.

I just got back from a security summit in Munich, and I want to share some of my thoughts in talking to our allies and talking to strategic partners around the globe.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a decline of American leadership around the globe. There is a perception that America is on the retreat from the rest of the world and is an America tired of a decade of war, which I fully understand, and is an America that decides the fight is just not worth it anymore. The decline of American leadership around the world is not just something that we can't do because it is not good, but it is dangerous—not just to us, but to the rest of the globe.

Think about how we got in this position in the first place. It was the failure of American leadership through the nineties to pursue a terrorist jihadist by the name of Osama bin Laden. Instead, this Nation and the President treated him as a common criminal and not as a declared opponent and a war opponent of the United States of America. What we saw was an attack on the World Trade Center, an attack to the USS Cole, an attack on the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, and then, finally, it culminated in an attack that took 3,000 American lives and woke America up to the reality of global jihadism and terrorism, and the fact that we have people that live solely for the purpose of killing and destroying people that don't see eye to eye with their specific religious ideology.

Failure to confront those terrorists in the 1990s led to that big problem we have today. And what we have seen lately is the same kind of retrenchment by the United States of America—undoubtedly, still the most powerful country in the world. Our enemies no longer fear us, and our allies no longer trust us.

Let me label a few of these areas that have concerned me.

In Iraq—I am a veteran of Iraq—the U.S. Marines actually fought to take the city of Fallujah and took the most casualties that they have taken probably since Khe Sanh in Vietnam. Today, the black flag of al Qaeda flies over Fallujah. The sacrifice of thousands of Americans is now being confronted by the black flag of al Qaeda because this President, eager to achieve a campaign promise, pulled all the troops out at the end of 2011 and didn't leave a residual force. As unpopular as it may be, if we had left a counterterrorism force in Iraq, we would not be facing this problem today.

I look at a terrible deal that was just struck with Iran, a deal that basically says Iran is allowed to be a threshold nuclear state. Sure, the Secretary and the President will say that we are going from 20 percent enrichment to 5. He doesn't mention that bringing 5 percent enrichment to weapons-grade enrichment actually doesn't take that long. And, oh, by the way, all the surrounding states to Iran think that they are totally entitled to say that they have a right to enrich uranium up to 5 percent, in essence, creating a whole host of Middle East threshold nuclear states. And yet we call this a victory?

I look at Syria—11,000 opponents to Assad, tortured and murdered and labeled with numbers—11,000 people—which made Srebrenica, the thing that launched America to intervene in Bosnia, look small. Eleven thousand opponents to Assad tortured and killed. And you look at Assad, who is purposely targeting the Free Syrian Army and not al Qaeda opposition so that al Qaeda opposition grows to him and he can stand in front of the West and say, ''I am the protector.'' If we get to the point where we look to Assad, a brutal dictator in Syria, as the protector of freedom, God help us.

I look at instability in Lebanon, and I look at one of our greatest allies, Jordan, hosting hundreds of thousands of refugees. I look at Israel, surrounded by instability in the Middle East, and I look at a resurgent China that challenges America all over the globe now, and I look at a Russia that continues to occupy one-third of its neighbor to the south, Georgia. I look at Ukraine's people standing up for freedom. I haven't heard much from this administration.

I am burdened by this lack of American global leadership. I don't care about the politics of it. I don't care about any of this. I care about the future of this country. And what I see is the decline of American leadership in what is still the greatest country around the globe.

INCOME INEQUALITY

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Illinois is right. There is a decline in American leadership, but it is not overseas—not at all. It is here at home.

Since the 1970s, American workers have seen their wages fall or stagnate. The wealthiest American incomes, however, have increased fourfold. Even after 40 years of economic growth, today's generation takes home less than its grandparents did, and high school graduates make 40 percent less than their predecessors did four decades ago.

This problem ought to elicit bipartisan concern, yet many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have shown little or no interest in the consequences of our country becoming so sharply divided by wealth. For many of my Republican colleagues, even talking about it is uncomfortable. It is time to realize that all too many Americans—hardworking Americans—are falling behind.

From 1979 to 2007, wages for the top 1 percent grew 156 percent, while the bottom 90 percent of us saw our wages grow only 17 percent. Since 1983, 75 percent of the growth and wealth has been captured by the top 5 percent, while the bottom 60 percent actually suffered a net decline. By 2010, nearly all middle- and low-income families have made the same hourly wage they did in 2000, despite having raised productivity during that time period by 22 percent. That is not how it is supposed to work. Worse, median family income was 6 percent lower. But this lost decade only caps a trend that has been going on in this country for over 30 years.

In what might be the most telling portrait of how middle- and low-income Americans are being shut out of the

new economy, Bloomberg recently reported that 95 percent of wealth generated since the Great Recession went to the richest 1 percent—95 percent went to 1 percent. In real terms, 9 out of 10 people control less wealth than they did before the crash.

In 2012, the top 10 percent of earners took home more than half of the U.S. total income. This is the highest level ever recorded. Income and wealth haven't been this concentrated since before the Great Depression, and we are beginning to rival the gilded age of the late 19th century.

A recent Gallup poll shows that the concerns about inequality have moved beyond academia and into the public consciousness. According to Gallup, two out of three Americans are dissatisfied with income and wealth distribution in the United States, including 54 percent of all Republicans and 70 percent of Independents. The same poll found that many Americans now worry about their ability to find future opportunity, and only 54 percent believe that one can get ahead by working hard. What does that say about the American Dream?

Justice Louis Brandeis once said:

> We may have democracy, or we may have wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we cannot have both.

Letting a generation of Americans remain underemployed, underpaid, and despairing about their future creates a dangerous cycle of economic and social destruction, and it damages democracy. Nations whose citizens believe that the game is rigged against them are not beacons of democracy. Civic culture corrodes, and space opens for divisive and extreme politics. We have seen that here at home. The new Pope, Pope Francis, recently lamented that the world's inequality is quietly undermining social and political institutions. He gets it.

Last week, the President highlighted how our Nation's wealth and income gaps have become too large to continue to ignore. Congress cannot continue to stand idly by. I urge my colleagues to consider the many bipartisan proposals that would jump-start growth for all Americans. We need to be investing in this country's crumbling infrastructure. My own Put America Back to Work Act, which would reauthorize Build America Bonds programs, would give local government another tool to jump-start the economy and infrastructure projects.

Generations of Americans, starting with our Founders, made their way to America's shores, attracted by the promise of opportunity and the belief that, through hard work, they could get ahead. Unfortunately, that dream is at risk today.

I urge my colleagues to join all of us in preserving opportunity for all Americans, and prevent our Nation from becoming a nation of stark divide between the haves and the have-nots.

A GOVERNMENT THAT GOVERNS LEAST GOVERNS BEST

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union address last week, the President described an economy in which income inequality has deepened and upward mobility has stalled. Unfortunately, in many respects, he is right. The poor are worse off today than we were when President Obama took office. Nearly 7 million more Americans live in poverty today as compared to 2008.

A record 47 million Americans receive food stamps, 13 million more than when President Obama assumed office. Median household income has fallen over $2,000 in the last 4 years. Seventy-six percent of Americans live paycheck to paycheck, and the percentage of working-age people actually in the workforce has dropped to the lowest rates in 35 years. A full 92 million Americans are not part of the labor force. They are either unemployed or not even actively looking for work. They are so frustrated with the Obama economy, they have just given up. When taking into account marginally attached workers—workers who are unemployed but want a job and workers who have part-time jobs who want full-time jobs—the jobless rate today is over 13 percent.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years after this President took office, the state of the Union is not strong. But instead of admitting that his policies have failed, the President offered more Big Government and more class warfare. But, Mr. Speaker, a lack of government isn't the problem, and class warfare isn't a solution. The President says we need to raise the minimum wage and extend emergency unemployment insurance yet again, for the 13th time in his administration.

We should stop thinking small in this country. We are Americans. We should think big. We don't need minimum wages; we need maximum wages. We don't need more unemployment insurance and government dependency; we need jobs and self-sufficiency. The best way to combat income inequality, to restore upward mobility in the American Dream and create a healthy economy is for Washington to get out of the way, whether in the doctor's office, in the job market, or at the gas pump.

That means replacing ObamaCare with patient-centered reforms that will lower the cost of health care without growing government. It means cutting wasteful spending and making reforms to put the Nation on a path towards a balanced budget. It means comprehensive tax reform that rewards work, saving, and investment and allows individuals, families, and businesses to keep more of what they earn. It means rolling back provisions of Dodd-Frank that allow bureaucrats to take away choices, financial services, and products and limit access to credit and take those away from the American people. It means unleashing the energy potential of the United States by ending the war on coal and approving, immediately, the Keystone pipeline. And it means giving the poor a hand up rather than a handout, giving them a job instead of a government check, and giving them the skills they need to escape dependency so that they can achieve their God-given potential.

We can do all this. We can restore the American Dream, and we can restore opportunity and economic growth. And I stand ready to work to get America back on track.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH: THE NATIVE SONS AND DAUGHTERS OF ALABAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Black History Month and the countless contributions and sacrifices made by notable African Americans to this great Nation. I also stand before you to proclaim the month of February as a time of reflection for Alabama's Seventh Congressional District.

In honor of Black History Month, I thought it would be befitting that we pay honor and tribute to the native sons and daughters of Alabama that have made significant contributions not only to the great State of Alabama, but to this Nation. As representative of the Civil Rights District and a beneficiary of the sacrifices of so many, I have committed to sharing the stories of these extraordinary men and women throughout the month of February so that their contributions will forever be recorded and referenced in our Nation's history.

□ 1030

Today, I again begin with a tribute to Virgil Ware, 13, and Johnnie Robinson, 16. These American heroes and Birmingham natives lost their lives within hours of the historic bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church on Sunday, September 15, 1963.

While many of us have heard the heart-wrenching stories of the four little girls that perished in that bomb, many aren't aware that on that same day, Virgil and Johnnie were also victims of unspeakable and senseless violence.

Virgil Ware was born on December 6, 1949, in Birmingham, Alabama to James and Lorine Ware. He was the third of six children. One of his surviving brothers, Melvin Ware, describes Virgil as a special child who was exceptional in his educational endeavors. While his brothers were preparing for social gatherings, Virgil could be found reading a good book or perusing the encyclopedia. A few months before his death, the eighth-grader expressed to his older siblings that he was looking forward to joining them at the local high school next year. Before Virgil's

dreams could be realized, he fell victim to a tragedy that would change the Ware family and this community forever.

Virgil, who sat on the handlebars of his brother's bike, was headed to join his brother on a paper route on the outskirts of Birmingham, Alabama, on Sunday, September 15, 1963. The brothers rode past a group of men who had just left a segregationist meeting in the city. One of the men was told to shoot at the Ware brothers to ''scare them.'' The man fired two shots in their direction. One bullet struck Virgil in his chest and another in his cheek. Tragically, the young boy who loved to read and help his family lost his life on that day. Virgil was the sixth young person to lose his life on that Sunday in Birmingham due to blatant violence.

Just one hour prior to Virgil's death, Johnnie Robinson joined a group of young boys at a local gas station. Johnnie was born on February 25, 1947, to Martha and Johnnie Robinson, Sr. His younger brother, Leon, describes him as a kid who loved playing baseball and basketball. Ironically, his favorite subject was history. Even at the tender age of 16, he understood that he and his siblings were living in a historic era. He came from a close-knit family and had lost his father in a racially-motivated killing just weeks before his own death.

The afternoon that Johnnie went to the gas station, tensions remained high as local citizens were still reeling from the news of the church bombing and the deaths of the ''four little girls.'' According to accounts that were published in the Birmingham News article, Johnnie and other young boys were being taunted by White teenagers with chants of opposing integration.

There was also reports of rocks being thrown in retaliation in the hours after the bombing. In the midst of all the chaos, Johnnie was killed by a police officer.

Some of our Nation's biggest heroes are those that fought on the front lines in pursuit of equality and justice. However, young Virgil and Johnnie serve as symbols of the heroes of the movement that we don't always recognize. Johnnie and Virgil should be remembered for their important sacrifices that were made, and this history of our Nation should not forget them.

As we celebrate Black History Month and the notable contributions of African Americans to this country, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering these brave young men during the month of February and beyond. Their short lives serve as one of many catalysts for the transformative change in our country. While we know that their destinies were cut short, far too short, we remember them for their impact on the civil rights movement. During their short time on this Earth, these young souls should be counted in the number of our Nation's biggest heroes.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in celebrating the life and legacy of Virgil Ware and Johnnie Robinson, Jr., during this Black History Month period.

WORLD CANCER DAY

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, February 4, is World Cancer Day. It is a day we remember those lost to this disease while recommitting ourselves and our efforts to eradicating it. This World Cancer Day, people across the globe will speak out in one unified voice in hopes of improving knowledge about cancer and its symptoms while shattering the stereotypes and misconceptions that stand as barriers to the treatment.

By debunking the myths and bringing the fight against cancer to the global stage, we can make meaningful strides to address an issue that touches individuals, families, and communities worldwide.

This year alone, 1.6 million Americans will be diagnosed with cancer, and many of them will be children. As a member of the Childhood Cancer Caucus and a cancer survivor myself, I know how important it is to support each one of those cases with dedication and with care.

So today, let's recognize the thousands of oncologists, support staff, researchers, and families tackling this diagnosis from start to finish. If we work together, from government organizations like the National Institutes of Health, to hospitals and cancer treatment facilities in my home State of Pennsylvania, to passing bipartisan legislation like the Gabrielle Miller Kids First Research Act, we can make this World Cancer Day a success and put an end to cancer in the not-so-distant future.

WORLD CANCER DAY AWARENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Pennsylvania in recognizing that today, February 4, is World Cancer Day, a day in which we raise awareness about the impacts of cancer worldwide and join forces to work together to find a cure.

If America does not lead the world in cancer research, there is no leadership in cancer research in the world. A newly released report from the American Cancer Society says that the death rate from cancer has decreased by 20 percent over the past two decades. Thirty years ago, less than 50 percent of those who were diagnosed with cancer lived beyond 5 years of their diagnosis. Today, it is 65 percent for adults and 80 percent for children. Cancer research needs to be sustained if it is to be effective.

Ten years ago, 25 percent of all those grants that came into the National Cancer Institute were funded. Today it is less than 8 percent. We are not only losing important research but also losing talented researchers who leave the field because of a lack of public funding for cancer research.

Historically, there were three ways to deal with cancer. You could cut it out through surgery, you could burn it out through radiation, or you could destroy it through toxic chemicals or chemotherapy. Chemotherapy was developed in Buffalo in 1904 at Roswell Park Cancer Institute. After those traditional cancer treatments, with some debilitating side effects, a new generation about 15 years ago was developed to treat cancer called targeted therapies.

These are therapies that attack fast-growing cancer cells without destroying healthy cells. These targeted therapies led to promising new therapies in breast cancer, like Herceptin, which treated a very difficult cancer, late-stage cancer. Also Gleevec, which was highly effective in treating leukemia.

Today, the prestigious journal Science just declared that in 2013, the most important science discovery was something called immunotherapy. Immunotherapy uses several strategies, including vaccines, to treat the body's immune system to naturally fight cancers.

What the promise is in many clinical trials that are occurring throughout this Nation, including Buffalo's Roswell Park Cancer Institute, is longer remissions without the debilitating side effects.

We have a lot to learn about cancer. It is not one disease; it is hundreds of diseases. Lifestyle plays a very important part in the incidences of cancer, both here in the country and throughout the world. Eighty-nine percent of all lung cancers are due to smoking. Thirty percent of all cancers are a direct result of tobacco use. In our lifetime, one in every three women will develop invasive cancer in their lifetime. One in two men will develop invasive cancer because men smoke more.

We need to know that early detection is also important as well. Less than 10 percent of cancer deaths are attributed to the original tumor. It is when cancer moves, when it advances, when it metastasizes to a vital organ is when cancer becomes lethal. It is when cancer cells crowd out healthy cells and render that organ which we need to live useless.

So today on World Cancer Day, we are reminded about all of the work that has been done, all of the progress that has been made, and all of the progress still yet to be made. We also learned that while it is World Cancer Day, America has a unique role in the history, currently and prospectively, in developing the next generation of cancer treatments.

PROTECT ACADEMIC FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, in December of last year, the American Studies Association did a shameful thing. They decided to call an academic boycott of one nation, and that is the State of Israel. Think about that. They looked over every other country of the world and they said basically by omission: Oh, you're fine, and you're fine, and you're fine. It doesn't matter what is happening there or what is happening there, but we are going to go after one country, Israel, and we are going to call upon a boycott.

The former Israeli Ambassador, Michael Oren, after that happened, he asked this question:

Will Congress stand up for academic freedom?

And the answer is, yes.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join with 134 colleagues, myself included, to send a letter to the American Studies Association to admonish them on what is clearly an anti-Semitic effort on their part. I know that is a very harsh thing for me to say, but there is no other way to describe it. It is anti-Semitic.

I intend to move forward in the coming weeks to offer legislation called the Protect Academic Freedom Act which will prevent these campaigns by prohibiting Federal funds to universities that boycott Israeli academic institutions. Said another way, these organizations are clearly free to do what they want to do under the First Amendment, but the American taxpayer doesn't have to subsidize it. The American taxpayer doesn't have to be complicit in it, and the American taxpayer doesn't have to play any part in it. In fact, what we are doing on a bipartisan basis is calling for Congress to defend academic freedom because we recognize that academic freedom is at the very root of our own freedom.

CONGRESS CAN'T TAKE WATER THAT DOESN'T EXIST

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition of H.R. 3964, the so-called Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Emergency Water Delivery Act.

Mr. Speaker, California is suffering its worst water crisis in modern history. This is a 1 in 500-year drought. For the third year in a row, dry weather conditions and drought-like conditions are hurting so many families in California—farmers, small businesses. If you need to see how bad things have gotten, look at Folsom Lake in my district. It is dry. Over 500,000 residents in my community rely on Folsom Lake as the source of its water. This is how bad it has gotten.

We are doing everything we can to conserve water, but you can't take water when it doesn't exist, and that is why H.R. 3964 is such a bad bill. It is a bill that is taking what doesn't exist. It doesn't create any new water; it just tries to move water from one community to another, but it doesn't exist. You can't take water that is not there. In fact, let me show you how bad things have gotten.

□ 1045

The snowpack in California in the Sierras is the source of water for over 500 million Californians. It is what we rely on. It is our biggest reservoir.

You can see what the snowpack looked like January 2013. Here it is. You got snow right here—that is our biggest reservoir—and this is in the middle of the drought. Here is what it looks like today, January 2014. It is not there. The snow is not there.

So H.R. 3964 suggests taking water that doesn't exist. It is a bad bill. You can't falsely promise water delivery that doesn't exist. The water is not there.

Here is what my suggestion is to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Water is not about Democrats or Republicans. This is a solution that we have to come together. It is about protecting our communities. California is going to go through a devastating summer if we don't come together immediately as Democrats and Republicans to look at how we can conserve water and look for creative solutions on recycling water. But we've got to do this together—not pitting one region against another, not pitting one community against another. We have to come up with creative solutions. We can't just look at today's challenge. We have got to do that. That is an immediate issue. But we have also got to start discussing the future of water in California, looking at issues like storage, looking at issues like water recycling, looking at creative solutions because it is dry.

With that, let's come together as Democrats and Republicans, folks from the north State and the south State, and let's not pit one community against another. Let's solve this issue today for our children.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House of Representatives passed the Agricultural Act of 2014, a 5-year farm bill reauthorization, with bipartisan support by a vote of 251–166. This farm bill is a big win for the Nation's economy and will support jobs across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, while making necessary reforms that will save taxpayers billions.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this bill deliver for taxpayers, it is good public policy. We spent over 4 years crafting the measure through dozens of hearings, audits, and other forums for public and stakeholder input.

The bill was produced by the House-Senate conference committee, upon which I served, that was charged with resolving the differences between the House- and Senate-passed farm bills. Throughout this process, members of the Agriculture Committee have proved that positive movement on important pieces of legislation can be achieved.

This bill repeals direct payments and limits producers to risk management tools that offer protection when they suffer significant losses. Under the measure, limits on payment are reduced, eligibility rules are tightened, and means tests are streamlined to make farm programs more accountable.

The measure provides historic reforms to dairy policy by repealing outdated and ineffective dairy programs. It supports small businesses and beginning farmers and ranchers with training and access to capital.

The agreement reauthorizes numerous research, extension, and education programs, including programs for land grant universities, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, and the Agricultural Research Service.

This farm bill makes the first reforms to the food stamp program since the welfare reforms of 1996, while maintaining critical food assistance to families in need. It closes the heat and eat loophole that artificially increases benefit levels when States provide nominal LIHEAP assistance.

The bill also includes the Forest Products Fairness Act, a bill I introduced, which would open new market opportunities for timber and forest products by allowing them to qualify for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's BioPreferred program. It contains language codifying the Forest Service's authority to categorically exclude noncontroversial day-to-day activities from the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, assessments. It provides certainty to the forest products industry by clarifying that forest roads and related silvicultural activities will not be treated as a point source of pollution under the Clean Water Act and will no longer be subject to frivolous lawsuits.

It improves the farm bill conservation title through the consolidation of 23 duplicative programs into 13. Overall, the package reduces deficits by $16.6 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, for family farms and agribusinesses in my home State that drive the economy with more than $68 billion in total economic activity annually, this bill is a big win. For individuals and families in my home State that are looking for that next job or a little more take-home pay, this bill is

a big win. For the families and individuals that rely on safe and affordable food every day, this bill is a big win.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to quickly pass this bill and get it to the President's desk for his signature. Americans deserve as much.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Give them strength, fortitude, and patience. Fill their hearts with charity, their minds with understanding, and their wills with courage to do the right thing for all of America.

In the work to be done now, may they rise together to accomplish what is best for our great Nation and indeed for all the world, for You have blessed us with many graces and given us the responsibility of being a light shining on a hill.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING 20 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the service of Arkansas State University Agricultural Economics Professor Dr. Bert Greenwalt.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the Arkansas State University Agribusiness Conference, which Dr. Greenwalt has faithfully directed the past two decades. This premier agribusiness conference gathers attendees from across the country to focus on global agriculture, farm policy, commodity market outlooks, and biofuel research.

While maintaining a global focus, Dr. Greenwalt also manages to make the conference pertinent to Arkansas' agricultural producers, regularly bringing State ag leaders and university alumni to the event.

While attending Arkansas State University myself, I had the privilege of having Dr. Greenwalt as an ag policy professor, where I developed the skills necessary to serve on the Agriculture Committee in this body. Each day serving Arkansas' First District, I experience the same kinds of concepts and examples I learned in Dr. Greenwalt's classroom.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire Arkansas State University community in honoring the service of Dr. Bert Greenwalt.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, last month, the Social Security Administration announced proposed plans to close the Social Security field office in Amherst, New York, among other regional offices. This proposal is both unnecessary and ill-conceived and threatens the ability of seniors, international students, and individuals with disabilities to access critical services.

In response to this, I plan to introduce the Social Security Administration Accountability Act, which would require that the Social Security Administration provide Congress and local communities with adequate notice and justification for field office closings.

This bill would require that Congress receive a report which includes caseload data, service population, and staffing levels at field offices, as well as the process by which offices are selected for closing.

Mr. Speaker, the recent FY 2014 budget appropriated an additional $11.7 billion to the Social Security Administration for administrative expenses, which should provide the financial stability to alleviate the need to close field offices across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this request.

REMEMBERING TOM TEW

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart in remembrance of a dear friend and one of Miami's legal giants, Tom Tew. Tom passed away last week at the age of 73 from pancreatic cancer, an unfortunately common and terrible disease. Tom was the cofounder of the Tew Cardenas law firm and worked closely with my husband, Dexter, for many years.

Tom specialized in securities litigation, having represented the Florida Department of Insurance and the Securities and Exchange Commission, as well as having testified before this body on five occasions about securities and insurance fraud. Tom led a full life, including forming an intercollegiate boxing league and supporting the athletics program of our hometown University of Miami Hurricanes.

Tom's lovely and energetic spirit will be greatly missed. He is survived by his loving daughter, Kristina; brother, Jeff; sister-in-law, Maureen; his long-time partner, Marta; and his long-time secretary, Jo Anne.

We will miss you, Tom. You were a good friend to all.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO VICTOR E. PORTUGUES GARCIA

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend, Victor Portugues Garcia, who passed away this weekend in Puerto Rico. Victor Portugues served as under secretary of Housing for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from 1972 to 1976 and was an excellent engineer. His wife, Carmen Santa, has been a math teacher for many years, and they raised five children, all of whom graduated from prestigious universities.

I want to say to his family and to all of those who are going to miss him dearly that we are saddened by his passing and his death. To the Portugues family, we know that many people talk about infectious smiles. Victor's was truly an infectious smile. He always had something positive to say, always contributed to helping everyone else, and never asked for anything for himself. I don't know what more you can say about a human being. I know he is resting in peace, and I know that I look forward to being with him when I, too, leave this world.

Thank you, Victor, for all you have done.

THE REENLISTMENT OF STAFF SERGEANT MARY VALDEZ

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, on January 21, I attended a USARPAC Sisters in Arms forum in Hawaii, and I met a warrior and a hero. Her name is Staff Sergeant Mary Valdez. I watched in awe, inspired as she stood at attention with her right hand raised, tears streaming down her face as she swore to defend the Constitution, to obey the orders of the President, and to obey the orders of the officers over her.

Her strength and love for our Nation was palpable for everyone in the room, despite her having been savagely raped by a fellow soldier just weeks before her 2011 deployment to Afghanistan. She pressed charges, she took him to trial, and the man who raped her was acquitted and still serves in our United States Army today.

When she spoke after her reenlistment, tears streaming down her face, she said, ''I love being a soldier. I love this Army.'' Her courage, resilience, and commitment to fulfilling her duty is what makes our military the strongest in the world.

We owe it to Staff Sergeant Valdez and all servicemembers to bring about reforms so they are not faced with this kind of adversity. They are fulfilling their duty and their responsibility every day. We must fulfill ours.

CALLING FOR SANDY RELIEF OVERSIGHT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remind every Member of this Chamber that just over a year ago this Congress voted to provide $50 billion in much-needed Hurricane Sandy relief, including to my home State of New Jersey. I fought very hard for that money, and now this Congress has the responsibility and obligation to ensure that the Federal Sandy recovery funds are being distributed properly to the people who need it most. Constituents from my district are still displaced from their homes and are awaiting much-needed help.

According to a report released by the Fair Share Housing Center of New Jersey, low-income individuals are being denied claims at a higher rate than wealthier individuals. There is a need for more transparency on the standards being used to distribute these funds.

Also, a report on where and whom the funds are going to is obviously needed. I urge my colleagues to make sure that proper oversight is conducted and that the funding gets to those communities who are in most dire need.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, this is the third month that my colleagues and I have asked that unemployment benefits be extended to help our communities. Those benefits expired on December 28, and more than 1.7 million Americans, including 263,000 in California alone, have already lost access to these benefits, and another quarter of a million will be hit by the end of the month if we don't act.

Madam Speaker, if we act now, we can still help our friends and our neighbors who are trying to support their families as they find a new job instead of taking away what may be the only way they can afford food. There are more than 1 million Americans trying to do just that, and we should do everything we can to help them return to the workforce.

Previous Congresses have extended unemployment benefits time and time again with bipartisan support. Why is it that a program that we know helps members of our community and strengthens our economy is suddenly disposable? Let me remind you that these are unemployed workers who deserve our help.

I hope that we are allowed to vote on this bill and extend this vital economic lifeline.

COVERED CALIFORNIA ENROLLMENT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the success of California with the Affordable Care Act in bringing some of the highest enrollment numbers across this Nation. I am not surprised to see California leading the way; after all, we are the Golden State.

However, there is so much work still to be done by the 31st of March, which is the deadline for enrolling people this year. And I am going to work very hard, along with my California colleagues. I have reached out to our Covered California executive director, Peter Lee, and asked him to make sure that we enroll every single eligible Californian.

With only 8 weeks left for open enrollment, I am making it my top priority that every qualified resident of my 46th Congressional District is given the opportunity to enroll, and I strongly encourage all of my fellow colleagues to do the same. To make good on the promise of quality and affordable health care, it is not enough to educate. We must make sure everybody is enrolled.

THE FLOOD INSURANCE TRUST FUND

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge the Republican leadership here in the House to immediately take up the bill to provide flood insurance relief to millions of Americans across the country and develop a long-term solution for the flood insurance trust fund. Last week, the Senate passed, by a broad bipartisan vote, a bill to provide just such relief by a vote of 67 bipartisan Members in the affirmative.

I urge the House Republican leadership right away to take up the Senate-passed bill in the House for a vote. We already have over 182 bipartisan cosponsors that are ready to act.

Madam Speaker, there is great skepticism that this Republican-controlled House of Representatives will act to protect the middle class and to boost our economy across this country. Well, let's prove them wrong, and let's work together to pass a flood insurance relief bill as soon as possible. We can work together to solve this problem.

□ 1215

YEAR OF ACTION

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, happy Lunar New Year, or as we say in Hawaii, Kung Hee Fat Choy. This is the ''Year of the Horse,'' which has as one of its characteristics decisive action. It is said that it is not the year to procrastinate, and the lack of procrastination will bring success.

Remember President Obama said in his State of the Union, this year we are in the year of action. The people of this great Nation have been waiting for us to show action. Some have just given up hope on us, and you can't blame them. Let us show them that we are capable of doing the job that they sent us here to do by at least addressing critical legislation like creating jobs, restoring unemployment benefits, addressing the minimum wage, reforming the immigration system, and, of course, avoiding the default. Let's show them, Madam Speaker, that we are able to do this because we can.

SOLVING UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, solving our unemployment crisis is not only about restoring our economy, it is about restoring dignity to tens of millions of Americans. Unemployment means anxiety and insecurity that translates into worse mental and physical health. Unemployment

means lower lifelong earnings, not only for workers but also for their children. It means a loss of dignity that is impossible to quantify.

Madam Speaker, today with nearly 30 million Americans either unemployed or underemployed, we have a moral obligation to solve the crisis. Unemployment is rampant in both red States and blue States. Creating jobs means creating dignity.

We have bipartisan options to build a full-employment society, including proposals to spur public-private investments in infrastructure and close the skills gap, but we must act now.

The mantra of this Congress should be, could be, and must be jobs, jobs, jobs.

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 470

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. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, 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 Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill 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 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

Madam Speaker, I want to apologize for being 2 minutes late to come here. I apologize to not only you but also the staff and my friends from the Rules Committee for being late.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 470 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3590. This rule makes in order 11 amendments which provide for discussion and opportunities for Members of the minority and the majority to participate in this debate.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee, we held what I consider to be an open discussion about this bill where amendments were fully discussed and debated, and I am pleased to say that there will be these 11 amendments as a result of the action by the Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today represents a yearlong bipartisan, bicameral legislative process to protect our public lands and to preserve traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting for American sportsmen and sportswomen.

Specifically, H.R. 3590 improves access to Federal lands for hunting and fishing. It protects Second Amendment rights enshrined by the Constitution of the United States and promotes sportsmen's views by giving them a seat at the table through an innovative advisory committee to collaborate with the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture on ways to better conserve wildlife, habitat, and traditional outdoor activities.

American sportsmen are some of the strongest stewards of our Nation's unparalleled natural resources. We have an abundance of natural resources, but they all must be in a protected and stewardship role, and that is what the American hunter does for this country. They direct conservation projects. They establish nonprofit organizations to protect wildlife and precious habitat. Sportsmen are leading advocates to ensure that we leave a stronger, more vibrant America for future generations, and, I might add, we teach our children and the next generation the same so that the legacy that we leave is prepared for our future.

Additionally, according to the 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation, American sportsmen contribute roughly $90 billion in economic activity every year. These resources sustain thousands of American jobs and protect our Nation's rich outdoor heritage. They also provide many of our rural areas of this country with needed jobs, jobs for people who live in rural areas who care very much about conservation and of their local areas to keep them natural.

Unfortunately, all too often the Federal Government erects unnecessary barriers which prevent Americans from participating in the many activities that also should be available on Federal lands. That is why H.R. 3590 is important. It streamlines government regulations to allow for greater access to our Nation's public lands so that all Americans can enjoy everything that our great outdoors have to offer.

As a sportsman myself, I will tell you I have enjoyed our national parks. I have enjoyed State parks and the outdoors, and in particular, as a young Boy Scout growing up all of the way through being an Eagle Scout and an adult leader, I have utilized these resources, which has allowed me an opportunity to know more about America and to be able to pass it on to my sons and others. It is a great way to spend an afternoon or a weekend or a week with your family, the outdoors and learning more about America.

Today I want to thank the Natural Resources Committee Chairman DOC HASTINGS, who is from Washington. He understands the West, and he understands the outdoors. His leadership on this issue was essential, as well as that of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus cochairmen BOB LATTA from Ohio and BENNIE THOMPSON from Mississippi. Both of these men met with me and the committee early on to make sure that we would be prepared for their bills that would come to the floor as a package, with the understanding that on a bicameral, bipartisan basis, we would move this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. It is an omnibus bill that has been cobbled together in a back room by the Republican leadership. While the Resources Committee has considered some of these bills, not every bill made it through the committee process. In fact, two of the measures in this bill were never reported out of committee, and no committee considered this omnibus bill. So much for regular order.

Madam Speaker, we have a number of major time-sensitive issues that we should be tackling here in this Congress. We should be extending unemployment benefits for the 1.6 million Americans whose benefits expired on December 28, and the 72,000 more who lose them each week we fail to act. We

should be raising the minimum wage to help the too many Americans who work two jobs and still struggle to make ends meet. We should be finding common ground on comprehensive immigration reform to finally fix our broken immigration system. We should be bringing to the floor a clean bill to raise the debt ceiling, which yesterday Treasury Secretary Lew said we will hit by the end of the month. Defaulting on our national debt risks another downgrade of our credit rating. But we are not considering any of those items today.

Instead, we have before us another cobbled-together lands bill that goes much further than just expanding hunting and fishing opportunities on public lands. It undermines a number of commonsense, longstanding environmental laws that protect the beautiful lands that outdoor enthusiasts love, and it is loaded up with an array of unrelated provisions, like making it easier to import polar bear trophies.

Madam Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that 75 percent of all Federal lands are open to recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting. There are ample opportunities for hunters and fishermen to pursue these recreational activities, and H.R. 3590 effectively overrides several important, commonsense conservation laws, and elevates hunting and shooting ahead of all other legitimate uses of land. It does so without including several important bipartisan reauthorizations sought by outdoor sportsmen and -women and conservation groups.

Not only is the underlying bill bad policy, the process of bringing this bill is lousy. Despite the fact that this omnibus bill wasn't considered by any committee, the Rules Committee decided to close down the amendment process. The truth is that this rule makes in order every single Republican amendment, while only making in order one-third of the Democratic amendments. So much for openness and so much for fairness, Madam Speaker.

I am particularly disappointed that last night the Rules Committee failed to make in order an amendment that I was proud to offer with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and several other of my colleagues that would have reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund program uses royalties from oil and gas drilling to protect and preserve access to Federal and State lands. The stateside program has been especially important to the creation of parks and recreational facilities in my home State of Massachusetts. The Holt amendment reauthorizing LWCF is critical. This program will expire soon, and it needs to be reauthorized. The Holt amendment is germane and does not require any waivers, yet the Republican leadership blocked it, along with two-thirds of the amendments offered by the Democrats.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3590 is a bill in search of a problem. We saw a similar package last year that went nowhere in the Senate. I expect a similar fate for this year's version, because gutting environmental laws is a nonstarter for so many Members.

Madam Speaker, we should be focusing our time on the real challenges facing our economy. We should be extending unemployment insurance. It is unconscionable that we are just sitting here doing things like this, things that are going nowhere, while so many of our fellow Americans have lost their unemployment benefits. What are they to do? These are people looking for jobs and can't find them. We should be raising the minimum wage. We should be giving the American people a raise.

My friends on the other side of the aisle complain about all these government social programs. Well, the fact is that in the United States of America you can work full time and still earn so little that you will require things like food stamps and other government subsidies. We should stop subsidizing places like McDonald's or Walmart who don't pay their workers a livable wage.

We should raise the minimum wage. If you work in this country and you work full time, you ought not to have to live in poverty. We should fix our broken immigration system. We should also pass a clean extension of the debt ceiling so that we don't ruin this economy. These are the things we should be talking about. These are the things we should be debating. Those are the priorities facing our country and we are doing nothing. So, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule and on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts in not only his arguments, many of which were made in the Rules Committee last night as we properly went through, I believe rather meticulously, in answers to what the gentleman brought up. It is important to note that three Democrat amendments were withdrawn. One Democrat amendment was not germane, and several other Democrat amendments I think we effectively said they will be tackled either in another piece of legislation or, because they are a larger bill that needs to be heard by the committee, updated. And, in fact, the land bill is set to be done next year, 2015, with its expiration. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Washington, DOC HASTINGS, very meticulously covered his thoughts and ideas about that. And he told the Rules Committee that, in fact, he did believe that it would need to be updated on a bipartisan basis.

DOC HASTINGS, as the chairman, also stated that the majority of his bills that he had brought to the committee, at least under his chairmanship, were done on a bipartisan basis, where there was an agreement within the committee to move the bills, and while there may be disagreements about all the parts of the legislation, that they garnered respect from each other out of their committee. It was not the Republican leadership. In fact, it was the Rules Committee that made the decision based upon testimony that they heard upstairs, listening to the committee chairman, understanding the committee's thoughts and ideas, and then moving appropriately.

The gentleman from Massachusetts does make other points about jobs bills. And I would point to a Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan CBO report that came out today that talks about the effects of a new update about the Affordable Care Act, which is known, as President Obama alluded to here, as ObamaCare. The word ''ObamaCare,'' when used in that context, will push the equivalent of about 2 million American workers out of the labor market by 2017 as employees decide either to work fewer hours or to drop out altogether, according to the latest estimates from the Congressional Budget Office.

They said that there is a major jump in the nonpartisan agency's projection. It suggests that the health care law's initiatives and the incentives in it are driving business and people to choose government-sponsored benefits rather then work.

> CBO estimates that the ACA will reduce the total number of hours worked, on net, by about 1.5 to 2 percent during the period from 2017 to 2024, almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor—given the new taxes and other incentives they will face and the financial benefits some will receive.

CBO analysts wrote this in their new economic outlook.

They further stated that the rollout problems with the Affordable Care Act, known as the ACA, last year will mean that only some estimated 6 million people will sign up through the State-based exchanges, rather than the 7 million that the CBO had originally said would sign up.

What this means is that the laws that were passed as a result of President Obama, NANCY PELOSI being Speaker of the House, and HARRY REID being the Senate Majority Leader, they passed laws which are substantially reducing the number of people who actually work in America. There was a net some 230,000 people that lost their job this last month. The Affordable Care Act continues to be the number one reason why American businesses and small business employers do not hire more workers in this country.

The gentleman is correct that the Democrat leadership as well as ranking members from the Ways and Means Committee and the Budget Committee have approached the Rules Committee and asked for us to extend by 1.3 million people the number of people who would be extended long-term benefits.

I had a discussion with both SANDY LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member at the Budget Committee, and told them that the Republican Party in the House of Representatives has, since the President initiated this action and it was passed in the House, that we saw where there would be millions of people who would lose their jobs, that we would have unemployment at the numbers that we have, and that there is not one unintended consequence in this. These were well known, they were well understood. They were simply ignored by Democrats and the media as a possible probable outcome.

So I told both these gentlemen when they came to the Rules Committee that I would be very pleased to engage with them on a private basis, as a Member of Congress and them as a Member of Congress, on a way that we could add 1.3 million jobs if we were going to extend the unemployment compensation.

I believe it is immoral for this country to have as a policy extending long-term unemployment to people rather than us working on the creation of jobs. A job is the most important attribute, I believe, in a free enterprise system of a person, a family circumstance—for a husband, a wife, children when they are able at the appropriate age—to be able to have a job, to learn to take care of themselves, to be able to meet their needs, to be able to become engaged in their community and have self-respect enough to know that jobs are important.

I think too much time we have been hung up on—instead of the creation of jobs, we talk about the symptoms that are related to—unemployment and long-term unemployment. In this case, the President of the United States thoughtfully articulates the need for us to make sure we help people, but I believe he errs on the side of not pushing jobs bills, coming to the table as the President—as he said he would when he was a candidate, as he should as President—of working with Republicans and Democrats on well-understood ways that you create more jobs.

The President has chosen not to do this. It continues to be a 5-year pattern. I would note that when we had many of these same issues, or similar, when President Clinton was in office, he worked with Republicans. Granted, they were Republican ideas: balance the budget, welfare reform, cutting taxes, reducing rules and regulations. I do admit that is a complete Republican agenda. But we saw where one Democrat President joined with Republicans to work for a great opportunity for us to grow our economy, to face down other nations who were willing to not only grow their economies at our expense, but to add American workers and a brighter future for all Americans.

The Republican Party House leadership—Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR—have repeatedly stood at this podium for 5 years, and we have a constant theme, and that is: let's work together, not on raising taxes, not on more rules and regulations, not on job-killing health care ideas, but, rather, initiatives that the private sector—CEOs, small business leaders—say will help them to understand better the things that they need to go employ Americans.

Instead, the Democrat majority chose to do a bill, the Affordable Care Act, that at that time more than 55 percent of Americans opposed. We were told wait until you learn about it, you are going to love this; not just read it to learn what is in it, but the longer that you have it out there, it is going to be a real attribute.

Well, let me tell you what. We are going to find out this October when, instead of 8 million Americans are going to lose their health care and have to make decisions, there are going to be 80 million people. It will be at that time, or perhaps slightly before, when the American people will understand it was one party, one group of people—they are called the Republicans—who tried to warn us, who tried to hold some 47 individual votes on individual pieces of the Affordable Care Act that ruin employment, that make taxes even higher and move jobs overseas.

This is why the Republican Party is here today moving this bill. We will be here with a water bill tomorrow on the floor, and we will continue down the pathway of showing the differences of what we are for. We are for the American worker. We are for growing jobs. We believe the GDP is an embarrassment, and we believe that unemployment is immoral and we should add jobs.

So I am going to join my colleague SANDY LEVIN and my colleague CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and we are going to see if we can craft something that we would have on this floor. But it has got to net add over a million jobs, because that is what America needs, a real answer, not rhetoric.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, let me just say to my colleague from Texas, I think the Republican Party, and especially the Republican leadership of this House, should be ashamed of the obstructionism that has gone on to block every major initiative that this President has put forward to try to create jobs, and I think they should be ashamed of their indifference toward working families in this country.

My colleague talks about the Affordable Care Act. Millions and millions of people now have health insurance who before did not have it. That is just a fact. You may not like it, but it is a fact. Being a woman is no longer considered a preexisting condition with regard to health care. That is a fact. That is a good thing. That is a good thing. I would like to think my Republican colleagues would cheer that. Millions of young people can stay on their parents' insurance while they are looking for a job so they have the security of health care. That is a good thing.

CBO continues to say that the Affordable Care Act will reduce our deficit and repealing it, as my Republican friends want to do, would increase the deficit. That is nuts.

I repeat. What we should be talking about on this floor is extending unemployment insurance for those who have lost it; 1.6 million people lost it on December 28 and 73,000 people have lost it each additional week that has passed. The fact that we don't have a sense of urgency to do something about that is shameful. That is what we should be talking about.

My colleagues say we should have a pay-for, notwithstanding the fact that George Bush extended long-term unemployment benefits on a number of occasions and they never asked for a pay-for. But my colleague from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) came up to the Rules Committee with a pay-for saying we would pay for it with the savings from the farm bill. My friends say, well, that is not enough. I don't know what is enough.

□ 1245

How long does this indifference have to continue?

We need to do immigration reform. We need to raise the minimum wage so that when you work in this country you don't live in poverty. With regard to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we want to extend it for 5 years, not for a year at a time. We want to give communities an opportunity to plan—that is a good thing—and my friends have blocked that. It was germane, and my Republican friends said, no, you can't have a debate and a vote on it on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3370, the bipartisan House companion to the flood insurance premium increase relief bill, which the Senate has already passed. I also want to say to my colleagues that it is an issue we should be talking about now. That is more important than this bill that is before us and that is going nowhere.

To discuss the urgency of passing flood insurance relief, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding the time.

I also urge all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule and on the previous question so that we can take up and vote on the Senate-passed bill from last week, which would provide some relief to families and businesses across America from these unconscionable increases in flood insurance rates. It

would also give us time to work on a bipartisan solution.

Madam Speaker, for the past few months, I have offered on every single piece of legislation moving through the Rules Committee to this floor an amendment that would provide some relief to families and businesses across America on the flood insurance relief.

Here is why it is important.

We are dealing with the unintended consequences of a bill that Congress passed in 2012, which people were not aware of, that was going to really suck our neighbors with these high flood insurance increases, and FEMA did not follow through on their responsibilities. So the best course of action now is to pause. Kudos to the Senate. Last week, by a broad bipartisan vote, 67 members in the Senate passed a flood bill with the input of Realtors, families, businesses, and chambers of commerce from all across the country. It is vital that the House take up this bill right away.

Let me give you a few examples from back home in the Tampa Bay Area.

Paul Page lives in Ruskin, Florida. He says:

> My name is Paul Page. I am a retired, 30-percent disabled veteran living in Ruskin, Florida. I need your help now. I purchased my home in December of 2012. My flood insurance was $1,400 per year, but thanks to the Biggert-Waters Act of 2012, my flood insurance is rising to $5,400 a year. Please help me now.

James Smith in south Tampa owns property. His premium will go from $2,000 per year to $9,000 per year.

Frank and Shirley Davis in Shore Acres in St. Petersburg just listed their home for $175,000, but they are going to have a new annual premium of $4,000 that has now negated any chance they have of selling their home.

This is happening all across the country.

Madam Speaker, with this Republican majority, people have called it the ''do-nothing Congress.'' They are very skeptical that the Republican-controlled Congress can respond to middle class families and provide economic relief where it is needed. Here is a chance for the Republican majority to step up and address a very severe economic issue for families and businesses all across this country. The longer the Republican leadership puts this off, the greater economic harm it will cause to families and businesses across America.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question and the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have great respect for the gentlewoman from Florida. I would like to affirm that she has come to the Rules Committee and that it is the Rules Committee that has been pondering these questions and will continue to.

The Rules Committee, as of several weeks ago, attempted to work with—on a bipartisan basis—the Financial Services Committee, and there were not agreements that were done there on a bipartisan basis, so I think the committee of jurisdiction needs an opportunity to be able to faithfully look at it and to come up with an answer. I think a backstop would be as the Senate has done, which is simply to delay things for 4 years because of this government's inability to effectively do what they were tasked with doing.

Notwithstanding, I very much appreciate the gentlewoman and her constant comments, not just to me but also to members of the Rules Committee, in order for us to understand that we do have to come up with an answer on this. I wish today were that answer. We will continue to work at it, and I appreciate the gentlewoman very much for her continued insistence with me. I have also told one of my and her colleagues—the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)—as well as members of the Rules Committee that, on the Republican side, we will continue to work on this, and I expect us to be successful.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think the Rules Committee ought to stop pondering and maybe start acting.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Texas say—and I appreciate his intensity—that he believes it is a flawed insurance policy that is government-sponsored. If that is the case, then it should be delayed, and he is willing to shut down the government to do it. I want to talk about something that is a flawed government insurance plan that is scientifically proven to be wrong—no debate about it—and that should be delayed, too.

I have a family in my hometown of Bourne, Massachusetts, who just bought a house. They bought that house for $240,000. They had a $400 bill—the predecessors did—for flood insurance. They were shocked, and I was shocked: that bill has now increased to $44,000 a year. If you take away the value of their home, in about 2 or 3 years, with the payments for flood insurance at that rate, it will be the whole value of their home.

I want to also tell you that it is a government taking, in effect, I think, to have this policy in effect because, if they go to sell that home and if someone has to get a mortgage to buy it, as most people have to do, the value of that home is going to be diminished. Someone is probably going to have to pay cash—maybe pay $100,000 for a $240,000 home. That is government reaching in, taking the value of their nest egg—of all of their life savings of the place they live—away from them.

Now, I said it is scientifically proven. I want to show you. I went to the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth. Their coastal study experts there—scientists, engineers—said that what FEMA did in establishing the maps upon which these rates are based is flawed. In fact, they used the Pacific Ocean methodology on the Atlantic Ocean. That is how fundamental the flaws are.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KEATING. There is my county in Plymouth, which I represent. By taking this through the appeals process and bringing in the study that I was able to obtain from UMass, they took the whole county of Plymouth in Massachusetts, and it now has this insurance plan delayed.

It shouldn't just be my county in Plymouth that is delayed. FEMA can't do this throughout the whole country, as there is not enough time, but it should not just be my county. It should be all of Massachusetts. It should be the Northeast. It should be all the coastal areas and all the river areas in this country. They should be treated with fairness.

All we need on this is a vote. There are now 182 cosponsors, about a third of them Republicans. Let's get it to the floor. Let's be fair. When we have scientific evidence about a flawed insurance plan, let's make sure we get a vote on it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker and Members of Congress, we should not have to even debate this any further. It is outrageous that we have learned what we have learned about the failed implementation of FEMA with the Biggert-Waters plan and that we will not do something about it.

Let me just say this: I joined with Mrs. Biggert, and we tried to reform the National Flood Insurance Program. We went about it in a way that we thought would make it possible for people to be able to afford—to pay for—the National Flood Insurance Program and not in a way that would cause them to lose their homes. It passed through this House. It passed through the other body. It went out to FEMA. What did FEMA do? It did not do what we instructed it to do. First of all, we said: Have a study on affordability. The second thing we said was: Look at the way you do mapping and remap it. We encouraged them to get good data to be able to do this work.

They have failed us, and they have failed the citizens of this country. Not only have they failed the citizens of this country, but middle class people in this country—homeowners—are now about to lose their homes. A California family is facing a flood insurance premium increase from $1,700 per year up to $22,000 per year—an increase of over

1,100 percent. I have traveled around the country. I was down in Louisiana. We have Members across the country who are representing Florida and New York and California, on and on and on. They are begging this Congress to do something about these unintended consequences.

I was coauthor on the Biggert-Waters bill. I know what we attempted to do. These unintended consequences are just that. It should not be happening this way. This is not a partisan bill. This is a bill that has got support from Democrats and Republicans. You heard the previous speaker talk about 183 Members on this bill. The Senate passed it out with flying colors, and now it is on us. What are we going to do? Are we going to allow middle class families to lose their homes because FEMA has not done its job and has not done it correctly? Are we going to allow these families to be put out of homes that they have lived in for years because now, with these increased premiums, they can't sell them? This is unconscionable. We can do better than this. I can go on and on and tell you about the families and the letters we have received.

It is time for the House of Representatives to consider this legislation. We must address this problem now before one more family suffers from increased premiums, depressed home prices, or the inability to buy or sell their homes. Bring it to the floor. I have talked with the chairman of our committee. I would like everybody to address concerns to the chairman and get this bill to the floor so that we can help our homeowners and our constituents.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in fact, once again, the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, I believe, represents a truth. We need to get this done.

I think the committee last year, as I recall, began a process of re-looking at it, of trying to work through this issue. It is my belief and hope—and I have told members of the committee—that I intend to stay after this, but the Financial Services Committee does have the jurisdiction, and we are looking for an answer rather quickly.

I will continue to work with the gentlewoman from Los Angeles. I will continue to work with the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS, and I will continue to work with Ms. CASTOR from Tampa on this issue. I know that my dear friend from New York, Congressman MEEKS, has spoken with me a number of times about this.

So it is my hope that the Financial Services Committee will come with a recommendation—with a piece of legislation—on a bipartisan basis so that we can address this, and we will wait until that is accomplished. That is what I have told members of the committee. That is my hope, and I will continue to be engaged in this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just say that we don't have to wait for the Financial Services Committee to act. The Rules Committee shares jurisdiction on this bill. We should bring this to the floor now.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, last week, I received hundreds of calls and emails from my constituents across the Rockaway Peninsula, Broad Channel, and Jamaica Bay in New York's Fifth Congressional District. Most had been struck hard by the devastation of Superstorm Sandy, and were eagerly hopeful that relief was finally underway with the Senate's passage of the flood insurance relief bill.

My constituents then asked: How long will it take, and when will the House pass the Senate bill? Why is the House not taking up the Senate bill, or why is it being delayed? Let's put politics aside because, if there is ever an issue that should not involve politics, it is this issue, because this storm struck Democrats and Republicans. It struck everybody—rich and poor. Everybody was affected by it. So when will we put those differences aside so that we can get something done?

□ 1300

''Why?'' they ask, Madam Speaker.

It is time for us to respond to these Americans who have suffered too long and who need relief now. It is time we hear the voices of hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens who have been devastated by the unintended consequences and the botched implementation of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Act that led to dramatic increases in the cost of flood insurance. It is time that we on this side of the Capitol take up this legislation and address the problem before one more family suffers from increased premiums, depressed home prices, or the inability to sell their home.

I hope that, unlike what took place when we initially asked for relief, it is not the most extreme wing of the Republican Party that is blocking or stopping real relief for our Nation's homeowners and that we pass this important reform legislation today.

Madam Speaker, it is time that we pass the Homeowners Flood Insurance Act. It is time that we get it done. We need it done today. We need it done right now for relief for American citizens.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, last week, the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to fix the National Flood Insurance Program to protect homeowners from unaffordable rate hikes. It is beyond time for the House to follow suit by passing this bipartisan bill, which will help millions of Americans facing steep flood insurance rate increases, including thousands of residents across the Palm Beaches and Treasure Coast.

The bill includes additional funding for FEMA to redraw flood maps accurately so homeowners do not face erroneous rate hikes in my district and around the country. Any proposed rate hikes must be delayed until the affordability study gives Congress a better understanding of how unaffordable rate hikes would negatively impact the Flood Insurance Program.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can pass this bipartisan, commonsense solution that will provide much-needed relief for homeowners across America.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you to make this an urgent issue. Urgency, I think, is very critical here. So I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can consider the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

In the wake of Hurricane Sandy, over 74,000 National Flood Insurance Program claims were submitted in New Jersey from policyholders. To date, the NFIP has paid over $3.5 billion in Sandy claims. It has served as a lifeline to thousands of New Jersey residents whose lives were turned upside down by the storm. The funds paid out through those claims have helped our neighbors rebuild their homes and businesses.

Regardless of what political affiliation or persuasion, we are all affected by this. Estimates indicate that the total cost of Sandy will be between $12 and $15 billion, making Sandy the second-costliest flood event after Hurricane Katrina.

So, it is true that we need to make changes to ensure that NFIP remains solvent. However, the rollout of the 2012 reforms to NFIP have been fraught with issues.

I am hearing from constituents in towns such as Little Ferry and Moonachie, particularly, which were devastated by Sandy. This is destroying property values and disrupting the real estate markets in the communities of New Jersey and across the country. That is why it is so crucial that we revisit flood insurance reform by passing H.R. 3370.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. I thank the gentleman.

This legislation will prevent premium rate hikes until FEMA completes the affordability study called for in the original Biggert-Waters flood insurance reform legislation, giving FEMA a chance to implement an affordability framework before implementing new rates. The bill establishes

an appeal process for remapping and creates an advocate position within FEMA.

Just last week, a bipartisan majority in the Senate did approve this bill, as you already heard. It is time to bring this vital legislation to the floor.

Again, I appeal to the chairman. This is urgent, not simply because we had two major storms in the last few years, but because Americans all over this country are affected one way or another, if not by a storm off the ocean, a snowstorm or even worse. So I ask you specifically to do what you can to put this in front of us as soon as possible.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey, my dear friend, who joins with others of his colleagues who, in fact, most politely and appropriately have brought this issue to the Rules Committee.

I will tell you that there was an assertion made a minute ago that I was unaware of, and that was a jurisdictional issue that evidently the Rules Committee does have. I have tried to be forthright with this the whole time, and I believe it is the right thing for the men and women of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party who have approached me. I have consistently tried to invoke myself into the process with an answer, through the committee, which I thought was solely the committee of jurisdiction.

I will look at the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New Jersey, both very dear friends, who see me every day. I am not trying to evade. I am not trying to obfuscate. I am not trying to pass the buck on this. I have indicated I will be willing to be a part of this compromise. I will look back at the gentleman, my friend, Mr. PASCRELL, and tell him I am personally involved in this. I will continue to be involved.

I am delighted that the Senate came up with their answer, which was a short-term answer, not a fix. I believe that there is a fix that is trying to be looked at right now—one which I think is more amenable to the circumstance. If that effort fails, I will continue to stay in touch with not only the ranking member of the committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER, who has pressed me also, but also with my friends who have approached me today.

I will very respectfully acknowledge that what they are doing here today in coming to the floor to do this is appreciated. What I would say to them is I don't know that voting against the rule, believing they are going to take this down, would get this process done. It is not included in the rule. But I will tell each of my friends that are here today that I am going to continue to work on this, and I intend to have an answer quickly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last week, the President called on Congress to embark on a year of action—one in which we all work together to put opportunity and financial security within the grasp of America's families.

Just a few days later, the Senate took bipartisan action to protect thousands of homeowners in my home State of Florida and across the country from massive premium hikes on their flood insurance. These hikes are breaking the backs of America's families. They are bringing down home values at a time when our housing market is just starting to pick up again.

There is no question that the financial health of the thousands of families who could lose their homes as a result of these premium rate increases has to be an urgent priority of this House. Rather than gutting environmental protections, let's focus on the concerns of real homeowners. Let's pass the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act so that FEMA can reform the flood insurance program and protect America's families at the same time.

It is urgent that we move forward. I thank the gentleman for making this an urgent priority. The way to do this is to proceed with this today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act overwhelmingly passed the Senate with bipartisan support. It needs to pass the House of Representatives. We need to stabilize flood insurance rates before families are further impacted by FEMA's poor implementation, inaccurate mapping, and incomplete data, which has led to unimaginable increases in premiums.

We came together on a bipartisan basis in 2012 to reform the National Flood Insurance Program and put it on a path to stability, but Congress never intended to allow the punitive flood insurance premiums FEMA is now imposing on homeowners.

A constituent of mine from Milford, Connecticut, anticipates paying a rate as much as 5,000 percent higher than he was paying. And yes, I have heard from many constituents. The Senate legislation would delay these increases until FEMA completes the study ensuring that new rates are affordable for families, as was called for in the 2012 law.

182 Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, support a similar bill. We can get this done. We need to get this done. And we can do it today. I call on the Speaker to stop fiddling while Rome burns.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to bring the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act up for a vote.

It is crucial that we fix the critical problems created by the rushed implementation of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012. We cannot ensure the National Flood Insurance Program's long-term viability at the expense of homeowners and potential buyers.

Opponents of the Senate-passed flood insurance bill say that it overwhelmingly benefits wealthy Americans who buy beachfront property. I urge those opponents to come to my southern Illinois district. My district borders more than 150 miles on the mighty Mississippi. The folks who live there are not owners of second homes or vacation rentals, but are middle class families in Jackson, Union, and Alexander Counties, and in the American Bottom in the Metro-East St. Louis area.

Without reform, people in my district and across the U.S. will see their property values plummet. Many of these properties have been family homes for generations and have never once endured flooding.

I urge that we pass this act now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), a cosponsor of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act.

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I will take Mr. SESSIONS at his word, and I believe him to be sincere and genuine in his desire to see this problem fixed.

I would just remind Mr. SESSIONS and Congress that we don't have time to wait on this issue. Every day, there is a sale that is delayed or a sale that doesn't go through because the flood insurance is so high and the new purchaser doesn't want to pay for it. And every day, there is an owner short-selling a house because they have to get out of it, and they can't afford to wait.

So, when we talk about home ownership, we are talking about responsible Americans. We are talking about 1.7 million people in this country that saved up to participate in the bedrock of the American Dream. And now, government and FEMA and Congress are turning a piece of the American Dream into a government-made nightmare, and we have the ability here today to fix this.

Right now, we are not asking for politics. We are not trying to be overdramatic. We are just asking for a solution. We want to fix it. In fact, we are here today talking about a Republican bill that solves the problem. That is because, for me, this is not about politics. It is about people. It is about purpose. It is not about making sure that rich people who own riverfront, lakefront, or oceanfront property are taken

care of. It is about our seniors who want a home on Main Street or smack dab in our communities. They saved. They sacrificed. They did everything right. They played by all the rules. And now FEMA has come and decided they are going to create new flood maps.

The sad part about it is, if you are a community and you built levees and increased flood protection and you did it with your own money, FEMA does not even count it, because they didn't pay for it. So communities have saved money to help themselves, like we do in America. If we have a problem, we fix it. My community, which put up millions of dollars to build levees, doesn't even get that recognized because the government didn't pay for it.

Madam Speaker, I would just ask all my colleagues, let's do what is right. Let's help people, and let's put people over politics.

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

The gentleman from Louisiana is most accurate when he describes the problems which are associated with the way FEMA has initiated this process.

□ 1315

I will not sit here and beat anyone up over what they did or did not do. I recognize that I have disagreements myself. I have disagreements with myself, as a Member of Congress from Dallas, Texas.

What I would say to the gentleman—and he is sitting right next to the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee—these are issues that have to be resolved, and they are larger, I believe.

What you have heard me say today, I think they are trying to look at solving more than just the extension problem. They are trying to solve some problems. I could be wrong about that. I am not in the negotiation; I am around the negotiation.

But the gentleman, most assuredly, has come to the floor today for the right reason, I believe, with a pretty good message. Everybody is impacted that lives in these areas. We don't need to say one group of people or another or people that live in high-rises or low-rises.

What we do need to say is—and acknowledge, and I do—that each of my colleagues—I have been approached by colleagues on the Republican side and the Democrat side. I intend to stay after this issue, and I respect the gentleman for the way he approached it today, and I owe him. I am looking at him right in the eye. I owe him an answer on this too. I am part of the problem, just as he is, and we have got to find a solution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, we have a crisis, a crisis in Florida and across this Nation where our constituents are facing skyrocketing jumps in flood insurance premiums, making homeownership unaffordable.

Madam Speaker, floods are not partisan, and homeownership makes communities safer, more secure, and more economically vibrant.

Madam Speaker, let's fix this crisis now.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), my colleague.

Mr. LYNCH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question so this House can bring the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act up for a vote.

This bipartisan legislation will provide critical relief for families who have been devastated by outrageous flood insurance increases required by recent changes to the Flood Insurance Program.

FEMA's insistence on moving forward with these extreme rate hikes, without first completing an affordability study and certifying that their mapping techniques are accurate, as required by Congress in the Biggert-Waters Act, has created a crisis for working families who can't afford to pay 5 or 10 times more for flood insurance.

Before we ask the American taxpayer to pay 1 cent more in premiums, we need to ensure that FEMA is implementing the Flood Insurance Program in a fair and lawful way.

Now, we are not asking to repeal that law. We are just asking for a timeout while we figure this out, and we are asking that we do an affordability study so that we don't force people out of their homes. There is no sense doing it after the people are gone. We need this done in the right way.

We can help middle class homeowners across the country by voting ''no'' on the previous question and bringing up the Homeowner Protection Act.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I am here with the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee. She and I represent a city built in the desert suffering from a drought. We interrupted our rain prayer meeting to come here and to talk about how flood insurance is critical to the national interest.

We should not burden our economy with a situation in which people can't buy their home, sell a home, live in their home. It is time for us to defeat the previous question motion and take up on the floor of this House a bill that had overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate, that has 182 cosponsors here in the House.

It is time to stop partisan wrangling and deal with bipartisan legislation critical to homeowners from one coast to the other, and yes, a few in Los Angeles as well.

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

Madam Speaker, with great respect to the gentleman, I would, once again, offer an explanation, and that is that what they are talking about with this motion to recommit is not germane to the bill and would not go back to the committee of jurisdiction and so, by voting against what would be the rule or for a motion to recommit, would not accomplish what the gentleman is trying to do.

That is why I have tried to take, Madam Speaker, as I have tried meticulously, with speaker after speaker, my friends, my colleagues that have a strong opinion about this, I have tried to say to them that I do recognize that, while I don't believe I have the jurisdictional elements within the Rules Committee, that I will continue to work on this, and believe that there can be an answer.

So I would respond back to the gentleman from Los Angeles and tell him, thank you for coming to the floor, but an answer for this really needs to come from the committee, that we need to then work through the Rules Committee and get it on the floor. I am committed to that entire process and will continue to do that.

I thank the gentleman from Los Angeles, my friend, for him taking time to come down, but I don't want him to believe that, by winning a vote on the motion to recommit, that it will have any impact on that endeavor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I will ask the gentleman if he has any other speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman. I have no further requests for speakers either.

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the Rules Committee expressing his willingness to ponder and reflect and consider and contemplate and speculate on this legislation. But, look, time is of the essence here.

If the House votes to defeat the previous question, you know, we can bring this up. There is no reason why we can't bring this up. The Rules Committee has jurisdiction over this issue too, and if there are any glitches here, quite frankly, the Rules Committee can meet immediately and waive all the rules, because that is what my friends do on so many other bills.

One of the frustrations that we have on our side of the aisle is that my friends in the majority keep on bringing bills to the floor that mean nothing, that are going nowhere.

This issue of flood insurance is a big deal. You have heard from Members from all across the country. They want action now, not sometime in the future. They want it now. By voting to defeat the previous question, we can bring this up, we can deal with this, we can actually help some people in this country for a change and do the right thing.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if they don't defeat the previous question, defeat the rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I will, once again, do the very best that I can and, with great respect and appreciation to my very dear friend from Massachusetts—who has been a part of, since I recall at least early December, the discussion in the Rules Committee with the gentleman, his colleague, my colleague, from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)—Judge HASTINGS pushed this issue appropriately. The members of the committee from Florida have graciously pushed that issue forward.

The bottom line is that I believe the gentleman and I need to meet to speak about the jurisdiction that he refers to. The jurisdiction that I believe that the Rules Committee has is not related to the policy. The policy, which is what the provisions that are contained within the problems that we are talking about today, the policy issues are within the jurisdiction of the Financial Services Committee.

Today, we are on the floor of the House of Representatives with a rule with the jurisdiction to the Natural Resources Committee. The motion to recommit is not germane to the Natural Resources Committee.

So voting, or believing that you could, through a motion to recommit, winning that, and getting this bill on the floor through the previous question is simply not something that I believe is realistic, or something that we should even suggest to people that would happen.

What we are talking about today is a bill with the jurisdiction through the Natural Resources Committee, and I would like to confine my remarks now on the bill that is before the House.

Madam Speaker, I have had the pleasure of growing up as a lifelong Texan but had the opportunity to visit and live in other States in our great United States.

I have had an opportunity to visit national parks, national lands, land that is owned by all the American people. As an active Eagle Scout, and the father of two Eagle Scouts—and my father is an Eagle Scout—we have been in national parks all over this country.

That is what this legislation is about today. It is about national parks and the use therein. Some number of bills that have been cobbled together, yes, they were cobbled together so that we could come up with a policy, a policy that is trying to be worked on through a group of men and women here in the United States House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis, as well as a bicameral basis.

We had an understanding that we would try and do this about this week early last year. So I want you to know that what we are doing is bringing forth a bill which is important to people in how they deal with their families' recreation, as well as the importance of vital economic help to various areas of the United States.

I have witnessed the educational and recreational opportunities that we are talking about today, and they possess near limitless opportunities for not only my generation but the next generation of Americans who want to enjoy America.

I think that we, today, by this bill, have given us a refreshed new opportunity, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, to address that issue. That is why I support increasing access to public lands for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, so others may have this same opportunity.

So I am a ''yes'' and would encourage my colleagues to be ''yes'' on what the legislation is about today, not something that is not germane and another issue, which I have tried to appropriately address here today. It is urgent, but that is not what we are doing right here right now.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule, ''yes'' on the underlying legislation, and to be a part of moving this bill to the Senate, then on to the President's desk.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 470 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, 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 Financial Services. 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. 3370.

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 result 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. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam 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 this resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—193

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei
Andrews
Bishop (GA)
Cassidy
Gosar
Johnson (GA)
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Smith (WA)
Stockman

□ 1354

Mr. POLIS and Mses. HANABUSA and BASS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

AYES—234

Aderholt
Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—185

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Amodei
Andrews
Brownley (CA)
Cassidy
Gosar
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McCarthy (NY)
Miller, Gary
Rush
Schwartz
Smith (WA)
Stockman

□ 1404

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. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, last night, on rollcall Nos. 32 and 33 for H.R. 1791 and H.R. 357, I am not recorded because I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both.

Today, on rollcall Nos. 34 and 35 for the Rule on H.R. 3590 and H. Res. 470, I am not recorded because I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on both.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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 material on H.R. 3590.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 470 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. 3590.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1406

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. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUGENT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act, H.R. 3590, is a package of eight bills that protect the right of American sportsmen to fish and hunt from arbitrary and unjustified bureaucratic restrictions and limitations. It will remove government roadblocks to those activities on certain public lands and guard against new regulations that threaten hunting and fishing.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bipartisan bill. It is cosponsored by the Republican and Democrat chairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, Mr. LATTA of Ohio and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and the caucus vice chairs, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. In addition, Mr. BENISHEK of Michigan, Mr. HUNTER of California, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska all deserve credit for leadership on these important issues.

This legislation ensures that Americans' ability to fish and hunt will not be arbitrarily limited by the whim of Federal bureaucrats.

Title I of this bill directly responds to bureaucratic threats posed by the EPA. In 1976, Congress barred the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, from regulating firearms and ammunition. However, this has not stopped attempts to circumvent the law by claiming that, while EPA may not be able to regulate ammunition, it can regulate components of ammunition and fishing tackle. This would be a massive power grab by the EPA despite a clear lack of legal authority.

Banning lead bullets and tackle would increase costs for hunters, sports shooters, and fishermen, and cause economic harm to outdoor sportsmen and the recreation industry. This legislation ensures that the EPA does not—does not, Mr. Chairman—have the authority to regulate ammunition and fishing tackle.

Title II of this bill makes more funding available to States for a longer period of time to create and maintain shooting ranges, which preserves American tradition.

Title III would direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to allow, with a permit, commercial filming on Federal lands for crews of five or fewer. This permit would ensure a fair return to the taxpayer in exchange for use of their lands.

Title IV of this bill would allow for the importation of legally taken polar bear hunting trophies from Canada that, through no fault of the sportsmen, have become trapped in a bureaucratic limbo. This is focused squarely on resolving existing permits snarled in red tape and does not open the door to any future imports.

The next two titles of the bill would allow sportsmen across the country to more easily obtain a Federal duck stamp by making them available for purchase online and would protect law-abiding individuals' constitutional right to bear arms on lands owned by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Title VII establishes a Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee in order to protect the rights of sportsmen while finding a balance with commonsense conservation.

The last title of the bill requires Federal land managers to support and facilitate use and access for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting on Forest Service and BLM land. It protects sportsmen from arbitrary efforts by the Federal Government to block public lands from hunting and fishing activities by implementing an "open until closed" management policy. However, it does not prioritize hunting and fishing over other multiple uses of public lands.

Hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting are longstanding American traditions that deserve our protection. This important legislation is not a solution in search of a problem. Regrettably, bureaucratic threats to hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting are very real. That is why this bill has

broad bipartisan support and the endorsement of over 36 sportsmen's organizations. So I again commend the bipartisan sponsors of this package of bills, and I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In the past, I have voted for a number of the sportsmen promotion and protection packages. Unfortunately, it seems this one, with a number of extraneous and detrimental provisions to wilderness, wildlife refuges, and other areas, seems designed to turn what in the past has been a bipartisan consensus in favor of sportsmen's issues into a partisan issue, which is what we do with most everything around here these days, and that is unfortunate because we would be happy to address real problems as they are identified.

□ 1415

In this bill, we are going to essentially amend or override the Wilderness Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Refuge System Administration Act. These are all bedrock environmental provisions which protect public lands and wildlife and have not caused conflicts for sportsmen, hunters, fishers, and others.

Also, we have the throwaway little political thing. The EPA has already said: We don't have the authority to regulate land, and that is the end of it. But we are going to pass a law to say they don't have the authority that they don't have to regulate the land. Okay. Whatever. That is fine.

So then we also have a very broad agreement that hunting, fishing, and other wildlife-dependent activities can and should and have and will, ongoing, take place in wildlife refuges and wilderness areas. In fact, there is so much agreement on this point that existing law clearly supports such activities. As a result, hunting and fishing are popular and commonplace, pursued on public lands, the vast majority of which, outside of national parks in the lower 48, are open to hunting and fishing.

Now, reasonable legislation seeking simply to emphasize the importance of these activities would have been noncontroversial, whatever minor adjustments we might need to make. But to have a blanket exemption for operations in the National Wildlife Refuge System from all environmental planning under NEPA, the purpose of such a broad waiver is unclear, the motivation is unclear. It is definitely and potentially, or at least probably, very—I can't say ''definitely.'' But it could well undermine management in refuges in ways that will actually degrade habitat, which will mean less hunting and fishing opportunities, and degrade water, which means less hunting and fishing opportunities. That seems contradictory to the meritorious title of the bill, which doesn't seem to be reflected in the various parts, some of which have been through hearings, some of which haven't.

Now, the filming on public lands, I haven't heard of the controversy. There are some who purport that there might be some kind of problem for people who want to do hunting and fishing videos, films—I have seen quite a few of them—on public lands. There is no example of a problem that has occurred, but the new authority with a fixed rate of a maximum of $200 for a permit, no matter how much the impact might be of the film crew, and further, to open the door for the use of motorized equipment in wilderness areas for these filming activities is very, very problematic, objectionable, and unnecessary at this point. Again, there has been nothing brought up in a hearing about a credible complaint from a film company that couldn't do its wildlife film or its hunting film because of restrictions that were placed upon them.

It also would allow the construction of temporary roads. Now, I appreciate the fact the manager's amendment is going to prohibit permanent roads within wilderness areas that are designated necessary for access to hunting and fishing, but even temporary roads in wilderness areas for hunting and fishing are a clear and unnecessary degradation, a violation, of the existing Wilderness Act. And many horseback hunters or hunters who access on foot in my State, I have never been petitioned by them to open up roads into wilderness areas so they can better hunt. They are concerned about the ongoing review and closure of roads by the Forest Service, and I have been actively involved in that.

But in this case, we are saying no. Now we can have temporary roads into wilderness areas, something that no one has ever asked me nor made a case that is necessary for hunting. So it is slightly improved from the early versions, but we are still concerned about temporary roads and that is not something we want in our wilderness areas. I don't think that weakening or changing the definition of ''wilderness'' helps expand access for hunting and fishing nor the opportunities in those areas.

Also, the bill has some pretty glaring omissions that actually would tremendously benefit the sportsmen's communities. That would be programs that support wetlands conservation, the preservation of outdoor recreation facilities, North American Wetlands Conservation Act, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which are key in expanding opportunities or protecting continued opportunities to hunt and fish as we see more and more urban encroachment onto traditional hunting and fishing areas. We could use those tools. We need those tools—they are both expired—and they are not allowed to be part of this package.

There were various other amendments offered that we will get to later in the discussion that were not allowed that could have improved this package. We will go through the amendment process and try to deal with some of the concerns, but at this point, as written and introduced, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), my colleague.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I am interested in title IV in this legislation, which is a good piece of legislation. The provision in title IV of H.R. 3590 has the support of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the President of the United States. This provision is the Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act. It is a bipartisan measure that would make a very limited fix to an issue that affects a number of hunters nationwide.

Prior to the threatened listing of the worldwide polar bear population on May 15, 2008, there were a number of hunters that took hunting trips to Canada under Canadian law and United States law. These hunters followed all the rules at the time and were prevented from bringing in their polar bear trophy due to the threatened listing triggering an importation ban under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

My legislation, H.R. 3590, will allow the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits to only those qualified hunters with legally taken polar bear trophies prior to the May listing date. This legislation will allow up to 41 hunters to import their trophies from Canada.

As a result, roughly $41,000 would be available to the United States-Russia Polar Bear Conservation Fund to support conservation activities for the shared polar bear population. This is a provision that would bring in revenue for conservation activities that otherwise would not be funded.

As a result, I urge Members to support this legislation and keep in fact these are dead polar bears in storage hunted legally under the premise of Canadian law and United States law. This is a good part of this bill.

By the way, speaking of this bill, it is a good bill. From the State of Alaska are more parks and more refuges than any other State. The Refuge Department doesn't allow us to hunt on refuges in many areas. The Park Service definitely doesn't allow us to hunt. I am arguing that the park and refuge areas are set aside for the refuge managers themselves and not for the people of America, let alone the people of Alaska.

This legislation is the right way to go. Let's think about public lands, not the king's lands, not the administration's lands, but the lands of the people. This bill is a good bill. I urge the passage of this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The Committee will rise informally.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

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

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentleman from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), cochair of the Sportsmen's Caucus.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Oregon, for allowing me to speak in support of this legislation even though he has reserved time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013. Today's bill is the product of the work of members of the bipartisan Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, which I serve as cochair. The Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus is the largest caucus in Congress, boasting nearly 300 members. The caucus seeks to advance hunting, angling, shooting, and trapping legislative priorities. Today's bill is comprised of eight individual bills that seek to promote these interests.

Mr. Chairman, not only is hunting and fishing a great passion for millions of individuals like myself, it is also a major contributor to the U.S. economy. Mississippi, home to some of the world's finest duck, whitetail, and sport fishing, contributed $2.2 billion to the economy in 2011 alone.

My congressional district receives scores of visitors each year, including some Members of this body, who come to enjoy the vast natural resources that the Mississippi Delta has to offer. When these individuals visit Mississippi, they hire local outfitters, stay in our hotels, eat at our restaurants, pay State hunting fees, and purchase hunting gear like Primos brand hunting calls, which are produced in my district in Flora, Mississippi. In fact, it has been estimated that hunting and fishing supports 33,000 jobs in Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today makes improvements to a wide range of issues, including the ability to purchase duck stamps online; statutorily establish the Wildlife Hunting and Heritage Conservation Council, which was administratively formed by Secretaries Salazar and Vilsack in 2012. It also reduces a financial burden on States and local governments for target range construction and maintenance. It also excludes commercial ammo and fishing tackle from being classified as toxic substances, which the EPA has agreed. It also directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a permit and assess an annual fee for commercial filming crews of five people or fewer for activities on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary. It also allows law-abiding citizens to transport firearms across Army Corps of Engineers projects like the hundreds of miles of levee that I have in my district. And it also opens up more Federal land to hunting and fishing.

Mr. Chairman, while this bill makes tremendous strides to meet the needs of sportsmen, there are several other provisions that were not included in this bill that we must continue to push for, including an overhaul of the Red Snapper Management in the Gulf of Mexico, the ability to convert decommissioned oil rigs to fish habitat, and the reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3590.

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013, better known as the SHARE Act.

I commend my friend and cochair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, Representative BOB LATTA of Ohio, for his leadership in guiding this bill to the floor.

I am also proud to join with the Sportsmen's Caucus cochairs, both Representative LATTA and Representative BENNIE THOMPSON of Mississippi, and vice chair Representative TIM WALZ of Minnesota in support of this important bill.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, I would also like to thank Chairman DOC HASTINGS for his work and cooperation on behalf of America's sportsmen to support this legislation through the committee process.

As a sportsman, I am humbled to advocate for this community and help introduce this legislation to advance priorities for American anglers, hunters, and conservationists.

This commonsense package will expand opportunities for recreation, support fair treatment, and modernize programs for sportsmen, and includes a proposal I authored to allow migratory waterfowl hunters to purchase their annual Federal duck stamp online.

As vice chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I can proudly say that this provision is important to waterfowl hunters across the country. Title V, the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act, is supported by the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and Ducks Unlimited.

I would also like to acknowledge Representative RON KIND as an original cosponsor of the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a dedicated conservationist and longtime supporter and friend to sportsmen.

There is no cost to taxpayers. There is broad bipartisan support for this innovative idea, and this convenient 21st century delivery system will be utilized by thousands of American sportsmen in the future.

□ 1430

Again, I would encourage my colleagues to support this important package, H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I just inquire as to how much time remains on either side?

The ACTING CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this legislation, and I would hope that my colleagues will read it and look before they leap. It is called the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013. Unfortunately, this is mired in a muck of text in the legislation that I think does just the opposite of enhancement. It ought to read, ''Kill the Habitat and Wildlife and Enjoy a Dead Forest Act.''

This bill diminishes the conservation measures designed to protect the habitat for wildlife by creating loopholes in the Wilderness Act and weakens the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, process.

Title I, for example, amends the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the EPA from regulating toxic substances contained in bullets, angling lures, and other hunting equipment with respect to toxic substances.

It is not just people that are affected by toxic substances; so are animals. Here they prohibit barring lead in bullets. Now, California is a big hunter's State. Guess what? California State law prohibits the use of lead. Why? Because the Federal Government has spent millions, millions, and millions of dollars trying to restore the California condor. Does that count? Ask the Ventana and Post Ranch Inn. Post Ranch is $1,000 a night—nobody can afford that—but it is filled all the time. Why? Because you can see condors and mountain lions and sea otters and other things that we have protected by protecting their environment.

What does a condor die from? It eats dead things. It eats things that have been killed by bullets. It eats that lead, and guess what? It kills the condor. It is done over and over again. There is no question about this. This is the number

one cause of death in condors in California after we spent all this money trying to get them restored. This act wipes all that out.

It is going to hurt the economy, and you know what? People call themselves sportsmen. The sportsmen I know don't want to kill the wildlife by poison or destroying the habitat. That is why the bill passed in California banning lead bullets. This one prohibits States like California from doing that.

Even the military is moving toward pursuing a lead-free environment for their small arms. So it is a serious problem. This bill bans that. This is nuts.

Lead poisoning from ammunition is the way you kill off wildlife, not by a good shot. You kill it off by the poison that is left behind. That is why Governor Brown signed into law a ban on lead bullets, and they phased it in to 2019. This follows what at least 30 other States have already done in regulating lead ammunition in some manner.

So, if we really want to protect and enhance the environment, then we ought to do what the original conservationists did who were the hunters by switching to non-toxic ammunition, and allow them to continue on good conservation efforts, which is the heritage of hunters in this country.

This legislation is a step backwards for sportsmen. I am a fisherman. I certainly don't want to put stuff in the ocean or in lakes that is toxic, and conservation practices protect our public lands, our open spaces, and our wilderness areas.

So, I urge my colleagues to look before you leap. Don't jump in just because there are a bunch of people endorsing this bill. Look at the type. Look what it does. Look at the small print. I urge you to oppose this legislation until it can really be legislation that will be a Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act. As of now, it deserves your opposition.

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield myself 2 minutes of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013, or the SHARE Act.

I would like to talk a little bit about title VIII of the bill, which is the text of a bill that I introduced, the Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act. Like many of my colleagues here in Congress, hunting and fishing are an important part of the lives of the constituents in my district. I grew up in north Michigan, and like many of my constituents, I spent my summers fishing, my Octobers hunting grouse in the U.P. woods.

These traditions of spending quality time outdoors with our kids and grandkids are the kind of things that we must make sure are preserved for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, this portion of the SHARE Act seeks to create an ''open until closed'' policy for sportsmen's use of Federal lands. As you know, nearly a quarter of the United States land mass, or over 500 million acres, are managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service. These lands are all owned by all Americans. It is important that the right to fully utilize these lands is ensured for future generations.

Over the years, legislative ambiguity in the Wilderness Act has opened the door for numerous lawsuits over the country. Rather than embracing sportsmen and -women for the conservationists that they are, anti-hunting and environmental groups have pursued an agenda of eliminating heritage activities on Federal lands for years. These groups look for loopholes in the law to deprive our constituents the right to use their own Federal lands.

Recreational anglers, hunters, and sporting organizations, many of whom have endorsed this bill, are supporters of the conservation movement and continue to provide direct support to the wildlife managers and enforcement officers at the State, local, and Federal levels. These dedicated sportsmen and -women from the shorelines of Lake Superior to the beaches of the Pacific Ocean deserve to know that the lands that they cherish will not be closed off to future generations.

This is a bipartisan issue. In fact, Presidents Clinton and Bush both issued executive orders recognizing the value of these heritage activities. It is time we finally closed these loopholes, firmed up the language and made sure that future generations will always be able to enjoy the outdoors—hunting, fishing, and shooting or just taking a walk in the woods.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage all of my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important piece of commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how many more speakers does the gentleman have?

Mr. BENISHEK. I have six more speakers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I have no more speakers except myself, so I would suggest the gentleman go ahead.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3590, the SHARE Act.

As a fifth-generation Montanan and as a lifelong sportsman, I know that hunting, fishing, motorized recreation, and hiking are simply a way of life for us in Montana. The outdoors is a critical aspect of our culture, and as 30 percent of our State is owned by the Federal Government, we depend on responsible stewardship and public access to these lands. Unfortunately, our Federal Government too often imposes rules and regulations that prevent responsible land use and our freedom to use the land that we pay for.

Roughly 2 million acres in Montana are inaccessible to the public. That is the most of any State in the Nation. Many of our hunting and fishing opportunities are locked away. The SHARE Act is an important bill that will protect Montanans' access to public lands for outdoor recreation. Too often, the Federal Government forgets that hunters, anglers, outdoorsmen—those whose livelihoods and passions rely on the land—respect our outdoor landscape the most and are the best stewards of our public lands.

Here we have the Federal Government trying to expand its authority over lead bullets, keeping millions of dollars spent on ammo and fishing tackle by hunters and anglers from being used for conservation and wildlife management. Like its Senate counterpart, the SPORT Act, this bill would protect our sportsmen and industries that manufacture these goods from these unnecessary regulations.

The SHARE Act would also protect our Second Amendment rights where the administration has tried to constrain them. It ensures that State and local governments are consulted in decisions managing shooting ranges, and it ensures that real outdoorsmen, instead of a bunch of Washington bureaucrats, are advising the administration on conservation and sportsmen issues.

Simply stated, the SHARE Act is an important bill to protect America's outdoor heritage and to ensure the responsible use of our public lands. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act, or SHARE Act.

I have introduced this legislation on behalf of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, of which I am the co-chairman with Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, whom I thank for his work. I also would like to thank Chairman HASTINGS for his support of the various bills contained in this sportsmen's package, as well as to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman UPTON. I would also like to thank all of my colleagues who have introduced the individual bills that make up this package legislation.

As a lifelong hunter and outdoorsman, issues relating to hunting and conservation are extremely important to me. This legislation includes various pro-sportsmen's and pro-sportswomen's items that will help ensure our outdoor traditions are protected and advanced. H.R. 3590 also addresses some of the most current concerns of America's hunters, recreational anglers, shooters, and trappers.

Title III of the bill is legislation I introduced related to public lands filming. This provision directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, for any film crew of five persons or fewer, to require a permit and assess an annual fee of $200 for commercial filming activities or similar projects on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary. This prohibits the Secretary, for persons holding such a permit, from assessing any additional fee for commercial filming activities and similar projects that occur in those areas during public hours.

I have also introduced the language contained in title VII, which permanently establishes the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee. This council advises the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on wildlife and habitat conservation, recreational hunting, and shooting. Authorization of the council is vital to ensuring that hunters maintain an advisory capacity role across future administrations. The passage of H.R. 3590 will not only elevate the stature of the council, it will also provide the levels of certainty and stability necessary to ensure the council's ability to engage in assisting the government in devising and implementing the innovative, long-term solutions that are often necessary to address policy issues important to sportsmen and sportswomen.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENISHEK. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LATTA. The passage of H.R. 3590 is important to our sportsmen and -women to allow open access to Federal lands, as well as to provide the needed certainty for the rules surrounding these activities. These hunters and anglers provide a tremendous economic benefit to our country. In 2011, they spent over $90 billion. In my home State of Ohio, sportsmen and sportswomen spent $2.85 billion on hunting and fishing. That is more than the revenues for corn, the State's top-grossing agriculture commodity that year.

H.R. 3590 is good for the sporting and conservation communities, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) would remain on the floor for a moment, I would like to direct to the gentleman a question about the filming provision. I am curious as to what problems specifically have been identified regarding filming permits. The second question would be: Is it the gentleman's intent that they should be able to use mechanized filming on tracks and otherwise motorized filming in wilderness areas?

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first, there are a lot of smaller companies out there that don't have the large film crews and that don't have the large backups when it comes to funding in order to be able to do these types of activities. So I want to make sure that those individuals have that ability to be out there with a smaller fee so they can go ahead and make the films they want to make.

□ 1445

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, as I understand the current process, there is not one large fee. The fees vary in terms of the agency. If it is a one-person crew or a four-person crew, whatever, the fees would be smaller. If it is a mega film coming from Hollywood, they would charge a larger fee, is my understanding.

I am just wondering if there has been a specific case where someone has come to the gentleman and said, Gee, we are a two-person crew, and they want to charge us $10,000. Do we have any specific examples?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, what we have had has come to us from the discussions we had with the sporting community. Again, this is a product of multiple groups coming together. When we looked at the cost of the fee, et cetera, they thought it would be appropriate at this level of $200 for the annual fee, again, for these very small groups out there that want to go out and film.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Further, the issue of mechanized filming equipment, motorized equipment being used in wilderness areas. And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. That is one of the sections in the title that would permit that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Does the gentleman feel that we should waive the Wilderness Act for film crews, but not other activities?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, when you look at mechanized vehicles, it can be anything from a very small ATV. You might not be talking about a truck, or something like that, but something very small.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I think this is a solution in search of a problem. We have had no testimony before the committee and no specifics were provided here. I believe it is an overly broad provision. If we had cases where extortionate fees were being charged for small groups or unreasonable fees that weren't following this scale basis that the agency tells me they follow, then I would share the gentleman's concerns.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HASTINGS for his support in including H.R. 322, the Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act, as title I of the sportsmen's package.

I also want to thank the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus colleagues and the leadership of Chairman BOB LATTA and BENNIE THOMPSON for their efforts to protect sportsmen's rights and preserve our Nation's heritage.

Title I of this measure simply clarifies the existing intent of law regarding EPA's authority under the Toxic Substances Control Act with respect to traditional ammunition and fishing tackle that contain lead components. This legislation would prevent the EPA from expanding its regulatory authority under TSCA into an area where fish and wildlife agencies are better positioned to manage.

What the several antihunting and antifishing groups who insist on the expansion fail to recognize is that the ammunition, firearms, and tackle industries, along with sportsmen and -women, are the ones that are footing the bill to manage, protect, and create the same species' habitat that they claim they are trying to save. There is no sound evidence of traditional ammo and fishing tackle with lead components causing harm to wildlife populations or human health that would warrant a complete ban.

I would also say that one of my colleagues came to the floor earlier and said that this particular piece of legislation would in fact prevent States like California from banning lead ammunition. That is not true. Doing so in disregard of the intent of the law, the EPA would devastate countless domestic manufacturing facilities, drive up the cost for law enforcement and for our military, destroying thousands of jobs and hurting wildlife conservation funding—all at the expense of the taxpayer, and that is a cost that should not be borne.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman had remained on the floor for a moment, I was going to direct a question to him, which is: Since the EPA has found it does not have legal authority to regulate these substances, why do we need to pass a law to prevent a law from being passed? Which I guess is what we are trying to do here. In case we wanted to ever consider a law to do this, we would say, Well, we already passed a law to prohibit that.

Because the EPA says they don't have the authority to do this, it is not going to happen. There was a petition filed. It was rejected. End of story.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act.

The bill protects the Second Amendment rights of visitors to Army Corps

recreation lands. The Army Corps of Engineers has more outdoor recreation visitors than the National Park Service or the Forest Service lands. My district is home to many of these recreational lands, such as Lake Raystown or the Youghiogheny River.

While we currently have protections for American's Second Amendment rights in National Park lands and forest lands, the same rights are not protected on Corps properties. This bill corrects that. It removes unnecessary firearm restrictions while maintaining the safety and security of Corps buildings and property.

I urge all Members to support the Second Amendment and vote in favor of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act.

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

I would like to ask the chairman a question regarding that, since this is under the jurisdiction of our committee and I am not aware that we held a hearing on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHUSTER. I don't believe we did this year, but I think in the past we did.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I have many Corps areas in my district, and I am not aware of restrictions, except there are restricted areas because a number of these projects have sensitive equipment that operate spillways and dams and other things, and those are high security areas post-9/11.

I am wondering if the gentleman's interpretation of this is that it would allow people to carry sidearms into these high security areas.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHUSTER. It protects people's rights, just like in the State forests and other properties of the Federal Government, to carry firearms; law-abiding citizens. I think it is something reasonable, and something I support. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reclaiming my time, I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, a gun owner myself. I haven't had a single complaint about Corps restrictions in my State, and that would include areas where we have had tampering with machinery that relates to spillways and dams—potential terrorism. I wouldn't want to facilitate terrorism.

If we are talking about general Corps areas and lands being managed, fine, but if we are talking about sensitive, secure areas that have to be protected and guarded, I don't see why we would allow civilian firearm carry within those sensitive protected areas, which would make us vulnerable to terrorism.

Terrorists without a weapon, I suppose they could bring in a weapon anyway. They could violate the law, but if someone were noted bringing a weapon into one of those areas now, they would be asked to leave or apprehended.

So I am concerned about those aspects, and I think that my committee and Homeland Security should have looked at this issue before it was brought to the floor without a hearing.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3590, the Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013.

I would like to speak specifically to title VI of the bill.

The fundamental constitutional right to bear arms must be protected for all law-abiding citizens. Americans deserve the right to exercise their rights to not only enjoy recreational activities, but also provide self-defense for themselves and their loved ones.

In the 111th Congress, this body passed legislation that ultimately became law which allows for guns to be legally possessed and carried on lands within our National Parks. Following enactment of that legislation, the Army Corps of Engineers immediately issued the following release:

> Public Law 111–024 does not apply to Corps projects or facilities. The passage of this new law does not affect application of title 36 regulations.

The Corps administers over 11.7 million acres of land, including 400 lakes and river projects, 90,000 campsites, and 4,000 miles of trails. Much of this land is remote and without quick access to emergency services or law enforcement, so the ability to carry a firearm in the case of emergency is imperative.

This Army Corps policy preempts State regulatory frameworks for transporting and carrying firearms, thus invalidating concealed weapons permits and other State laws that allow law-abiding citizens to exercise their Second Amendment rights.

Title VI of the bill is aimed at protecting these rights by ensuring the right to carry at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Water Resource Development Projects. Specifically, this legislation prohibits the Secretary of the Army from enforcing any regulation that prevents an individual from possessing firearms on these properties, thereby restoring the continuity to Federal law.

Gun owners need to able to exercise their Second Amendment rights when they are legally camping, hunting, and fishing on Army Corps projects.

I would like to thank my colleague from Ohio, Representative LATTA, for including my bill into this piece of legislation.

I urge Members to support title VI and this legislation as a whole.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire how many more speakers the gentleman has.

Mr. BENISHEK. We just have one more speaker, and I will close after that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, the ranking member, and the committee as well, for putting in H.R. 2463, the Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act, that Congressman WALZ from Minnesota and myself wrote.

Basically, what this does is allow Americans to use Federal lands that they pay for in order to go out and shoot for sport at target ranges. With fewer ranges today, providing greater flexibility to States for the purpose of maintaining public shooting venues will go a long way to restoring recreational opportunities and promoting gun safety.

In San Diego, there are no public ranges that we can use. We have to go to an indoor range or to someone's private ranch. There are no more public facilities.

The Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act uses existing resources to allow Americans greater access to lands on which to safely practice recreational and competitive shooting. Shooting sports participants already provide significant support to conservation efforts through excise taxes on firearms and ammunition. Public shooting ranges will continue to serve the interests of families and communities, providing a safe place for target practice and instruction while also sustaining jobs and supporting local businesses.

This is a great bill. I would urge my colleagues to support it because shooting—and shooting well—is an American tradition. You shouldn't have to join the Marine Corps to learn that.

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

I would agree with the gentleman. That came out of committee unanimously. It is a true bipartisan proposal. I learned to shoot through the Y in a basement range with a .22. That is where I started. We have got to learn somewhere.

The public lands is another place for families to go and learn to shoot. So that is one of the noncontroversial parts of the bill. In fact, four of the components of this bill could have been brought up yesterday under suspension or even, I believe, unanimous consent. Definitely under suspension. They definitely would have passed them. They have been previously considered by committee, subject to hearings, and the language was agreed upon. Unfortunately, the majority has insisted, although I also believe that the title would get unanimous consent in this body—it is a great title—but sometimes we attach provisions to great titles that aren't necessary or belie that title.

Some of the components of this, which I have talked about—the potential for degradation of wetlands management, wildlife refuge management, intrusions into wilderness areas—are

inappropriate and unnecessary. We can do a little political ''gotcha''—you voted against this bill that has this great title, so that means you are against sportsmen and fishing and hunters and families enjoying those activities.

□ 1500

I am not, and very few, if any, Members of this body are. But, be that as it may, we have pointed out a number of the problems in this legislation.

Legislating is really a pretty difficult exercise, to do real things, to do things that actually would benefit our wildlife resources and hunting and fishing activities. One would be Congressman DAINES' proposal to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Every day development proposals move forward that take more and more wildlife areas, more and more wetlands, more and more forests out of access to hunting and fishing and recreation in many cases. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been a key in protecting those lands, when jeopardized, and purchasing from willing sellers to prevent that kind of development.

Though we are still collecting the tax that funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund—yes, we are collecting the tax. Even the Republicans haven't proposed that we do away with that tax because they are spending Land and Water Conservation Funds on other things; God only knows what. Some of the earmarks in a bill we will take up later this week. I don't know.

But they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars that are supposed to go to benefit sportsmen and -women, hunters, fishers, wildlife, and protect those areas and manage them reasonably with that full access. They are spending that money somewhere else, so they don't want to take away the tax, but they don't want to reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That is a shame, and that would be a much bigger benefit than anything else that we are doing here today.

We have a number of bipartisan wilderness proposals pending: Mr. REICHERT, from Washington State, Alpine Lakes; Mr. BENISHEK, Sleeping Bear Dunes; and others that are pending. Those things would benefit since wilderness does allow hunting and fishing and does provide a degree of protection for those lands that is unparalleled. That would be an experience for horseback hunters, people who walk in on their own two feet. But there are plenty of places to go in a motorized way. It is a little more rare to have an opportunity to do that from horseback or hiking.

But we are not considering those today because those are controversial. So instead, we have this kind of hash that we are calling one thing and doing a number of other things with.

We have the proposal that we have a problem with unidentified film crews who have never come forward, who might be charged too much or need to use motorized equipment in wilderness areas and so, therefore, we are just going to open them up. That is kind of a heck of a way to legislate, really.

We are worried that maybe some units, and definitely the dam areas of the Corps of Engineers, prohibit individuals carrying weapons. That is not exactly an intrusion. They can't carry a weapon into an airport. You can't carry a weapon into the Capitol. You can't carry a weapon into a Federal courthouse, and you can't carry a weapon to a dam site where tampering with equipment could cause a massive flood or dam failure. It makes a little bit of sense to me, but the bill says, no, that is an infringement on the Second Amendment. I think it is a reasonable step by the government. So we are going to open that up, again, without any hearings identifying any problems with access.

I have a lot of Corps projects in my State. I have never had a constituent call and say, gee, I want to go on to this Corps property and bring my gun. I have got a concealed weapons permit, and I have carried a gun on many Federal lands where there is no restriction, and I supported the park provision last year. But we are creating another imaginary problem so we can add yet another title to this hash of a bill. So I am sorry that we are having to go forward in this way.

I did support a less controversial measure for sportsmen heritage in the last Congress, and even that didn't go anywhere in the Senate. This one already has an affirmed veto threat from the White House, and the Senate isn't going to take it up.

But we can pretend we did something here today, and some people get excited about the fact that we did something here today that will never happen. We could, and it is much harder, agree on a bipartisan measure for reasonable measures to protect people's right to hunt and fish and bear arms, but we are not going to do that. So let's get on with the political show.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just make a couple of points. I want to make a very, very broad point on what the intent of this legislation is, because it is aimed at uses of public lands.

Now, I have always been of the mind that public lands, particularly Federal lands, unless Congress designates otherwise, then the uses of those lands should be for multiple purposes. Now, obviously recreation, i.e., hunting and fishing, would be part of that.

So what this bill seeks to do, then, is to provide certainty into Federal laws that, indeed, multiple uses—in this case, hunting and fishing and recreational use—will be on public lands. There is nothing really more complicated than that.

What has caused this legislation to be brought forward is because of actions of certain bureaucracies within certain parts of the Federal Government that have a different decision, if you will, or a different idea of that, and they slow down this recreational activity. So this seeks to put certainty in that.

Lastly, let me just respond to the arguments that we heard about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Mr. Chairman, that is a program. There are people that think it is a very, very good program. There are those, including me, that feel that sometimes it is not as good as it is simply because you acquire private land for the Federal Government. We can't maintain what we have. That should be a reason for, I guess, pause anyway.

But the reason I think that the Rules Committee did not make that particular amendment in order is for a very, very good reason. We talk about regular order around here. The Land and Water Conservation Fund statute does not expire until 2015. So I know, as chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, that the subcommittee in charge of that particular legislation is going to have hearings and we are going to go through the legislative process in order to reauthorize that.

So to rail against the idea that that amendment was not made in order somehow continues to break the program is simply not the case. The program is in place until it expires in 2015, and I have no doubt that our committee will come up with legislation to do the proper reauthorization.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very, very good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LATHAM). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3590

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 ''Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act of 2013'' or the ''SHARE Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
TITLE I—HUNTING, FISHING AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION ACT
Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Modification of definition.
TITLE II—TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT
Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Findings; purpose.
Sec. 203. Definition of public target range.

Sec. 204. Amendments to Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act.
Sec. 205. Limits on liability.
Sec. 206. Sense of Congress regarding cooperation.

TITLE III—PUBLIC LANDS FILMING

Sec. 301. Purpose.
Sec. 302. Annual permit and fee for film crews of 5 persons or fewer.

TITLE IV—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS ACT

Sec. 401. Short title.
Sec. 402. Permits for importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada.

TITLE V—PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMP ACT

Sec. 501. Short title.
Sec. 502. Definitions.
Sec. 503. Authority to issue electronic duck stamps.
Sec. 504. State application.
Sec. 505. State obligations and authorities.
Sec. 506. Electronic stamp requirements; recognition of electronic stamp.
Sec. 507. Termination of State participation.

TITLE VI—ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ACT

Sec. 601. Short title.
Sec. 602. Protecting Americans from violent crime.

TITLE VII—WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Sec. 701. Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee.

TITLE VIII—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE AND OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Sec. 801. Short title.
Sec. 802. Findings.
Sec. 803. Definitions.
Sec. 804. Recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting.

TITLE I—HUNTING, FISHING AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Hunting, Fishing, and Recreational Shooting Protection Act''.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF DEFINITION.

Section 3(2)(B) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2602(2)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking '', and'' and inserting '', or any component of any such article including, without limitation, shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants, and primers,'';

(2) in clause (vi) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and''; and

(3) by inserting after clause (vi) the following:

''(vii) any sport fishing equipment (as such term is defined in subsection (a) of section 4162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) the sale of which is subject to the tax imposed by section 4161(a) of such Code (determined without regard to any exemptions from such tax as provided by section 4162 or 4221 or any other provision of such Code), and sport fishing equipment components.''.

TITLE II—TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act''.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the use of firearms and archery equipment for target practice and marksmanship training activities on Federal land is allowed, except to the extent specific portions of that land have been closed to those activities;

(2) in recent years preceding the date of enactment of this Act, portions of Federal land have been closed to target practice and marksmanship training for many reasons;

(3) the availability of public target ranges on non-Federal land has been declining for a variety of reasons, including continued population growth and development near former ranges;

(4) providing opportunities for target practice and marksmanship training at public target ranges on Federal and non-Federal land can help—

(A) to promote enjoyment of shooting, recreational, and hunting activities; and

(B) to ensure safe and convenient locations for those activities;

(5) Federal law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), provides Federal support for construction and expansion of public target ranges by making available to States amounts that may be used for construction, operation, and maintenance of public target ranges; and

(6) it is in the public interest to provide increased Federal support to facilitate the construction or expansion of public target ranges.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to facilitate the construction and expansion of public target ranges, including ranges on Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 203. DEFINITION OF PUBLIC TARGET RANGE.

In this title, the term ''public target range'' means a specific location that—

(1) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

(2) is open to the public;

(3) may be supervised; and

(4) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting.

SEC. 204. AMENDMENTS TO PITTMAN-ROBERTSON WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) the term 'public target range' means a specific location that—

''(A) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

''(B) is open to the public;

''(C) may be supervised; and

''(D) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting;''.

(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—Section 8(b) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) Each State'' and inserting the following:

''(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State'';

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking ''construction, operation,'' and inserting ''operation'';

(3) in the second sentence, by striking ''The non-Federal share'' and inserting the following:

''(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share'';

(4) in the third sentence, by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting the following:

''(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary''; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following:

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the limitation described in paragraph (1), a State may pay up to 90 percent of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range.''.

(c) FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 10 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(3) ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Of the amount apportioned to a State for any fiscal year under section 4(b), the State may elect to allocate not more than 10 percent, to be combined with the amount apportioned to the State under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year, for acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range.'';

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) COST SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using a grant under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the activity.

''(2) PUBLIC TARGET RANGE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION.—The Federal share of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range in a State on Federal or non-Federal land pursuant to this section or section 8(b) shall not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the activity.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking ''Amounts made'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts made''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Amounts provided for acquiring land for, constructing, or expanding a public target range shall remain available for expenditure and obligation during the 5-fiscal-year period beginning on October 1 of the first fiscal year for which the amounts are made available.''.

SEC. 205. LIMITS ON LIABILITY.

(a) DISCRETIONARY FUNCTION.—For purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Federal Tort Claims Act''), any action by an agent or employee of the United States to manage or allow the use of Federal land for purposes of target practice or marksmanship training by a member of the public shall be considered to be the exercise or performance of a discretionary function.

(b) CIVIL ACTION OR CLAIMS.—Except to the extent provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, the United States shall not be subject to any civil action or claim for money damages for any injury to or loss of property, personal injury, or death caused by an activity occurring at a public target range that is—

(1) funded in whole or in part by the Federal Government pursuant to the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.); or

(2) located on Federal land.

SEC. 206. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING COOPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management should cooperate with State and local authorities and other entities to carry out waste removal and other activities on any Federal

land used as a public target range to encourage continued use of that land for target practice or marksmanship training.

TITLE III—PUBLIC LANDS FILMING

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide commercial film crews of 5 persons or fewer access to film in areas designated for public use during public hours on Federal lands and waterways.

SEC. 302. ANNUAL PERMIT AND FEE FOR FILM CREWS OF 5 PERSONS OR FEWER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section (1)(a) of Public Law 106–206 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6d) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(2) striking ''The Secretary of the Interior'' and inserting ''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (3), the Secretary of the Interior'';

(3) inserting ''(2) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—'' before ''The Secretary may include other factors''; and

(4) adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR FILM CREWS OF 5 PERSONS OR FEWER.—

''(A) For any film crew of 5 persons or fewer, the Secretary shall require a permit and assess an annual fee of $200 for commercial filming activities or similar projects on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary. The permit shall be valid for commercial filming activities or similar projects that occur in areas designated for public use during public hours on all Federal lands waterways administered by the Secretary for a 12-month period beginning on the date of issuance of the permit.

''(B) For persons holding a permit described in this paragraph, the Secretary shall not assess, during the effective period of the permit, any additional fee for commercial filming activities and similar projects that occur in areas designated for public use during public hours on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary.

''(C) In this paragraph, the term 'film crew' includes all persons present on Federal land under the Secretary's jurisdiction who are associated with the production of a certain film.

''(D) The Secretary shall not prohibit, as a motorized vehicle or under any other purposes, use of cameras or related equipment used for the purpose of commercial filming activities or similar projects in accordance with this paragraph on Federal lands and waterways administered by the Secretary.''.

(b) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—Section (1)(b) of Public Law 106–206 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6d) is amended by—

(1) striking ''collect any costs'' and inserting ''recover any costs''; and

(2) striking ''similar project'' and inserting ''similar projects''.

TITLE IV—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS ACT

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2013''.

SEC. 402. PERMITS FOR IMPORTATION OF POLAR BEAR TROPHIES TAKEN IN SPORT HUNTS IN CANADA.

Section 104(c)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1374(c)(5)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

''(D)(i) The Secretary of the Interior shall, expeditiously after the expiration of the applicable 30-day period under subsection (d)(2), issue a permit for the importation of any polar bear part (other than an internal organ) from a polar bear taken in a sport hunt in Canada to any person—

''(I) who submits, with the permit application, proof that the polar bear was legally harvested by the person before February 18, 1997; or

''(II) who has submitted, in support of a permit application submitted before May 15, 2008, proof that the polar bear was legally harvested by the person before May 15, 2008, from a polar bear population from which a sport-hunted trophy could be imported before that date in accordance with section 18.30(i) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations.

''(ii) The Secretary shall issue permits under clause (i)(I) without regard to subparagraphs (A) and (C)(ii) of this paragraph, subsection (d)(3), and sections 101 and 102. Sections 101(a)(3)(B) and 102(b)(3) shall not apply to the importation of any polar bear part authorized by a permit issued under clause (i)(I). This clause shall not apply to polar bear parts that were imported before June 12, 1997.

''(iii) The Secretary shall issue permits under clause (i)(II) without regard to subparagraph (C)(ii) of this paragraph or subsection (d)(3). Sections 101(a)(3)(B) and 102(b)(3) shall not apply to the importation of any polar bear part authorized by a permit issued under clause (i)(II). This clause shall not apply to polar bear parts that were imported before the date of enactment of the Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2013.''.

TITLE V—PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMP ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013''.

SEC. 502. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ACTUAL STAMP.—The term ''actual stamp'' means a Federal migratory-bird hunting and conservation stamp required under the Act of March 16, 1934 (16 U.S.C. 718a et seq.) (popularly known as the ''Duck Stamp Act''), that is printed on paper and sold through the means established by the authority of the Secretary immediately before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) AUTOMATED LICENSING SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''automated licensing system'' means an electronic, computerized licensing system used by a State fish and wildlife agency to issue hunting, fishing, and other associated licenses and products.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''automated licensing system'' includes a point-of-sale, Internet, telephonic system, or other electronic applications used for a purpose described in subparagraph (A).

(3) ELECTRONIC STAMP.—The term ''electronic stamp'' means an electronic version of an actual stamp that—

(A) is a unique identifier for the individual to whom it is issued;

(B) can be printed on paper or produced through an electronic application with the same indicators as the State endorsement provides;

(C) is issued through a State automated licensing system that is authorized, under State law and by the Secretary under this title, to issue electronic stamps;

(D) is compatible with the hunting licensing system of the State that issues the electronic stamp; and

(E) is described in the State application approved by the Secretary under section 504(b).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 503. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may authorize any State to issue electronic stamps in accordance with this title.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall implement this section in consultation with State management agencies.

SEC. 504. STATE APPLICATION.

(a) APPROVAL OF APPLICATION REQUIRED.—The Secretary may not authorize a State to issue electronic stamps under this title unless the Secretary has received and approved an application submitted by the State in accordance with this section. The Secretary may determine the number of new States per year to participate in the electronic stamp program.

(b) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—The Secretary may not approve a State application unless the application contains—

(1) a description of the format of the electronic stamp that the State will issue under this title, including identifying features of the licensee that will be specified on the stamp;

(2) a description of any fee the State will charge for issuance of an electronic stamp;

(3) a description of the process the State will use to account for and transfer to the Secretary the amounts collected by the State that are required to be transferred to the Secretary under the program;

(4) the manner by which the State will transmit electronic stamp customer data to the Secretary;

(5) the manner by which actual stamps will be delivered;

(6) the policies and procedures under which the State will issue duplicate electronic stamps; and

(7) such other policies, procedures, and information as may be reasonably required by the Secretary.

(c) PUBLICATION OF DEADLINES, ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, AND SELECTION CRITERIA.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which the Secretary begins accepting applications under this section, the Secretary shall publish—

(1) deadlines for submission of applications;

(2) eligibility requirements for submitting applications; and

(3) criteria for approving applications.

SEC. 505. STATE OBLIGATIONS AND AUTHORITIES.

(a) DELIVERY OF ACTUAL STAMP.—The Secretary shall require that each individual to whom a State sells an electronic stamp under this title shall receive an actual stamp—

(1) by not later than the date on which the electronic stamp expires under section 506(c); and

(2) in a manner agreed upon by the State and Secretary.

(b) COLLECTION AND TRANSFER OF ELECTRONIC STAMP REVENUE AND CUSTOMER INFORMATION.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO TRANSMIT.—The Secretary shall require each State authorized to issue electronic stamps to collect and submit to the Secretary in accordance with this section—

(A) the first name, last name, and complete mailing address of each individual that purchases an electronic stamp from the State;

(B) the face value amount of each electronic stamp sold by the State; and

(C) the amount of the Federal portion of any fee required by the agreement for each stamp sold.

(2) TIME OF TRANSMITTAL.—The Secretary shall require the submission under paragraph (1) to be made with respect to sales of electronic stamps by a State according to the

written agreement between the Secretary and the State agency.

(3) ADDITIONAL FEES NOT AFFECTED.—This section shall not apply to the State portion of any fee collected by a State under subsection (c).

(c) ELECTRONIC STAMP ISSUANCE FEE.—A State authorized to issue electronic stamps may charge a reasonable fee to cover costs incurred by the State and the Department of the Interior in issuing electronic stamps under this title, including costs of delivery of actual stamps.

(d) DUPLICATE ELECTRONIC STAMPS.—A State authorized to issue electronic stamps may issue a duplicate electronic stamp to replace an electronic stamp issued by the State that is lost or damaged.

(e) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE PURCHASE OF STATE LICENSE.—A State may not require that an individual purchase a State hunting license as a condition of issuing an electronic stamp under this title.

SEC. 506. ELECTRONIC STAMP REQUIREMENTS; RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC STAMP.

(a) STAMP REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall require an electronic stamp issued by a State under this title—

(1) to have the same format as any other license, validation, or privilege the State issues under the automated licensing system of the State; and

(2) to specify identifying features of the licensee that are adequate to enable Federal, State, and other law enforcement officers to identify the holder.

(b) RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC STAMP.—Any electronic stamp issued by a State under this title shall, during the effective period of the electronic stamp—

(1) bestow upon the licensee the same privileges as are bestowed by an actual stamp;

(2) be recognized nationally as a valid Federal migratory bird hunting and conservation stamp; and

(3) authorize the licensee to hunt migratory waterfowl in any other State, in accordance with the laws of the other State governing that hunting.

(c) DURATION.—An electronic stamp issued by a State shall be valid for a period agreed to by the State and the Secretary, which shall not exceed 45 days.

SEC. 507. TERMINATION OF STATE PARTICIPATION.

The authority of a State to issue electronic stamps under this title may be terminated—

(1) by the Secretary, if the Secretary—

(A) finds that the State has violated any of the terms of the application of the State approved by the Secretary under section 504; and

(B) provides to the State written notice of the termination by not later than the date that is 30 days before the date of termination; or

(2) by the State, by providing written notice to the Secretary by not later than the date that is 30 days before the termination date.

TITLE VI—ACCESS TO WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ACT

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Recreational Lands Self-Defense Act of 2013''.

SEC. 602. PROTECTING AMERICANS FROM VIOLENT CRIME.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Second Amendment to the Constitution provides that ''the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed''.

(2) Section 327.13 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, provides that, except in special circumstances, ''possession of loaded firearms, ammunition, loaded projectile firing devices, bows and arrows, crossbows, or other weapons is prohibited'' at water resources development projects administered by the Secretary of the Army.

(3) The regulations described in paragraph (2) prevent individuals complying with Federal and State laws from exercising the second amendment rights of the individuals while at such water resources development projects.

(4) The Federal laws should make it clear that the second amendment rights of an individual at a water resources development project should not be infringed.

(b) PROTECTING THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BEAR ARMS AT WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary of the Army shall not promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from possessing a firearm including an assembled or functional firearm at a water resources development project covered under section 327.0 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), if—

(1) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the firearm; and

(2) the possession of the firearm is in compliance with the law of the State in which the water resources development project is located.

TITLE VII—WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 701. WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 10. WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the 'Advisory Committee') to advise the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture on wildlife and habitat conservation, hunting, and recreational shooting.

''(b) DUTIES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Advisory Committee shall advise the Secretaries with regard to—

''(1) implementation of Executive Order No. 13443: Facilitation of Hunting Heritage and Wildlife Conservation, which directs Federal agencies 'to facilitate the expansion and enhancement of hunting opportunities and the management of game species and their habitat';

''(2) policies or programs to conserve and restore wetlands, agricultural lands, grasslands, forest, and rangeland habitats;

''(3) policies or programs to promote opportunities and access to hunting and shooting sports on Federal lands;

''(4) policies or programs to recruit and retain new hunters and shooters;

''(5) policies or programs that increase public awareness of the importance of wildlife conservation and the social and economic benefits of recreational hunting and shooting; and

''(6) policies or programs that encourage coordination among the public, the hunting and shooting sports community, wildlife conservation groups, and States, tribes, and the Federal Government.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall consist of no more than 16 discretionary members and 7 ex officio members.

''(B) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The ex officio members are—

''(i) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or a designated representative of the Director;

''(ii) the Director of the Bureau of Land Management or a designated representative of the Director;

''(iii) the Director of the National Park Service or a designated representative of the Director;

''(iv) the Chief of the Forest Service or a designated representative of the Chief;

''(v) the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or a designated representative of the Chief;

''(vi) the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency or a designated representative of the Administrator; and

''(vii) the Executive Director of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

''(C) DISCRETIONARY MEMBERS.—The discretionary members shall be appointed jointly by the Secretaries from at least one of each of the following:

''(i) State fish and wildlife agencies.

''(ii) Game bird hunting organizations.

''(iii) Wildlife conservation organizations.

''(iv) Big game hunting organizations.

''(v) Waterfowl hunting organizations.

''(vi) The tourism, outfitter, or guiding industry.

''(vii) The firearms or ammunition manufacturing industry.

''(viii) The hunting or shooting equipment retail industry.

''(ix) Hunting and shooting sports outreach and education organizations.

''(x) Tribal resource management organizations.

''(xi) The agriculture industry.

''(xii) The ranching industry.

''(D) ELIGIBILITY.—Prior to the appointment of the discretionary members, the Secretaries shall determine that all individuals nominated for appointment to the Advisory Committee, and the organization each individual represents, actively support and promote sustainable-use hunting, wildlife conservation, and recreational shooting.

''(2) TERMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed for a term of 4 years. Members shall not be appointed for more than 3 consecutive or nonconsecutive terms.

''(B) TERMS OF INITIAL APPOINTEES.—As designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, of the members first appointed—

''(i) 6 members shall be appointed for a term of 4 years;

''(ii) 5 members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years; and

''(iii) 5 members shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

''(3) PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ADVISORY STATUS.—No individual may be appointed as a discretionary member of the Advisory Committee while serving as an officer or employee of the Federal Government.

''(4) VACANCY AND REMOVAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any vacancy on the Advisory Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

''(B) REMOVAL.—Advisory Committee members shall serve at the discretion of the Secretaries and may be removed at any time for good cause.

''(5) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Each appointed member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of office to which such member was appointed until a successor has been appointed.

''(6) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed for a

3-year term by the Secretaries, jointly, from among the members of the Advisory Committee. An individual may not be appointed as Chairperson for more than 2 consecutive or nonconsecutive terms.

''(7) PAY AND EXPENSES.—Members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without pay for such service, but each member of the Advisory Committee shall be reimbursed for travel and lodging incurred through attending meetings of the Advisory Committee approved subgroup meetings in the same amounts and under the same conditions as Federal employees (in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code).

''(8) MEETINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretaries, the chairperson, or a majority of the members, but not less frequently than twice annually.

''(B) OPEN MEETINGS.—Each meeting of the Advisory Committee shall be open to the public.

''(C) PRIOR NOTICE OF MEETINGS.—Timely notice of each meeting of the Advisory Committee shall be published in the Federal Register and be submitted to trade publications and publications of general circulation.

''(D) SUBGROUPS.—The Advisory Committee may establish such workgroups or subgroups as it deems necessary for the purpose of compiling information or conducting research. However, such workgroups may not conduct business without the direction of the Advisory Committee and must report in full to the Advisory Committee.

''(9) QUORUM.—Nine members of the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum.

''(d) EXPENSES.—The expenses of the Advisory Committee that the Secretaries determine to be reasonable and appropriate shall be paid by the Secretaries.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, TECHNICAL SERVICES, AND ADVICE.—A designated Federal Officer shall be jointly appointed by the Secretaries to provide to the Advisory Committee the administrative support, technical services, and advice that the Secretaries determine to be reasonable and appropriate.

''(f) ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(1) REQUIRED.—Not later than September 30 of each year, the Advisory Committee shall submit a report to the Secretaries, the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate. If circumstances arise in which the Advisory Committee cannot meet the September 30 deadline in any year, the Secretaries shall advise the Chairpersons of each such Committee of the reasons for such delay and the date on which the submission of the report is anticipated.

''(2) CONTENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall describe—

''(A) the activities of the Advisory Committee during the preceding year;

''(B) the reports and recommendations made by the Advisory Committee to the Secretaries during the preceding year; and

''(C) an accounting of actions taken by the Secretaries as a result of the recommendations.

''(g) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—The Advisory Committee shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

''(h) ABOLISHMENT OF THE EXISTING WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council formed in furtherance of section 441 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 1457), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a), and other Acts applicable to specific bureaus of the Department of the Interior is hereby abolished.''.

TITLE VIII—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE AND OPPORTUNITIES ACT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act''.

SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) recreational fishing and hunting are important and traditional activities in which millions of Americans participate;

(2) recreational anglers and hunters have been and continue to be among the foremost supporters of sound fish and wildlife management and conservation in the United States;

(3) recreational fishing and hunting are environmentally acceptable and beneficial activities that occur and can be provided on Federal public lands and waters without adverse effects on other uses or users;

(4) recreational anglers, hunters, and sporting organizations provide direct assistance to fish and wildlife managers and enforcement officers of the Federal Government as well as State and local governments by investing volunteer time and effort to fish and wildlife conservation;

(5) recreational anglers, hunters, and the associated industries have generated billions of dollars of critical funding for fish and wildlife conservation, research, and management by providing revenues from purchases of fishing and hunting licenses, permits, and stamps, as well as excise taxes on fishing, hunting, and shooting equipment that have generated billions of dollars of critical funding for fish and wildlife conservation, research, and management;

(6) recreational shooting is also an important and traditional activity in which millions of Americans participate, safe recreational shooting is a valid use of Federal public lands, including the establishment of safe and convenient shooting ranges on such lands, and participation in recreational shooting helps recruit and retain hunters and contributes to wildlife conservation;

(7) opportunities to recreationally fish, hunt, and shoot are declining, which depresses participation in these traditional activities, and depressed participation adversely impacts fish and wildlife conservation and funding for important conservation efforts; and

(8) the public interest would be served, and our citizens' fish and wildlife resources benefitted, by action to ensure that opportunities are facilitated to engage in fishing and hunting on Federal public land as recognized by Executive Order No. 12962, relating to recreational fisheries, and Executive Order No. 13443, relating to facilitation of hunting heritage and wildlife conservation.

SEC. 803. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''Federal public land'' means any land or water that is owned and managed by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

(2) FEDERAL PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS.—The term ''Federal public land management officials'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior and Director of Bureau of Land Management regarding Bureau of Land Management lands and waters; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture and Chief of the Forest Service regarding the National Forest System.

(3) HUNTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''hunting'' means use of a firearm, bow, or other authorized means in the lawful—

(i) pursuit, shooting, capture, collection, trapping, or killing of wildlife;

(ii) attempt to pursue, shoot, capture, collect, trap, or kill wildlife; or

(iii) the training of hunting dogs, including field trials.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ''hunting'' does not include the use of skilled volunteers to cull excess animals (as defined by other Federal law).

(4) RECREATIONAL FISHING.—The term ''recreational fishing'' means the lawful—

(A) pursuit, capture, collection, or killing of fish; or

(B) attempt to capture, collect, or kill fish.

(5) RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.—The term ''recreational shooting'' means any form of sport, training, competition, or pastime, whether formal or informal, that involves the discharge of a rifle, handgun, or shotgun, or the use of a bow and arrow.

SEC. 804. RECREATIONAL FISHING, HUNTING, AND SHOOTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (g), and cooperation with the respective State fish and wildlife agency, Federal public land management officials shall exercise authority under existing law, including provisions regarding land use planning, to facilitate use of and access to Federal public lands, including National Monuments, Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, and lands administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable and primitive or semi-primitive areas, for fishing, sport hunting, and recreational shooting, except as limited by—

(1) statutory authority that authorizes action or withholding action for reasons of national security, public safety, or resource conservation;

(2) any other Federal statute that specifically precludes recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting on specific Federal public lands, waters, or units thereof; and

(3) discretionary limitations on recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting determined to be necessary and reasonable as supported by the best scientific evidence and advanced through a transparent public process.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Consistent with subsection (a), the head of each Federal public land management agency shall exercise its land management discretion—

(1) in a manner that supports and facilitates recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting opportunities;

(2) to the extent authorized under applicable State law; and

(3) in accordance with applicable Federal law.

(c) PLANNING.—

(1) EVALUATION OF EFFECTS ON OPPORTUNITIES TO ENGAGE IN RECREATIONAL FISHING, HUNTING, OR SHOOTING.—Federal public land planning documents, including land resources management plans, resource management plans, and comprehensive conservation plans, shall include a specific evaluation of the effects of such plans on opportunities to engage in recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting.

(2) NO MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—No action taken under this title, or under section 4 of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd), either individually or cumulatively with other actions involving Federal public lands or lands managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be considered to be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and no additional identification, analysis, or

consideration of environmental effects, including cumulative effects, is necessary or required.

(3) OTHER ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED.—Federal public land management officials are not required to consider the existence or availability of recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting opportunities on adjacent or nearby public or private lands in the planning for or determination of which Federal public lands are open for these activities or in the setting of levels of use for these activities on Federal public lands, unless the combination or coordination of such opportunities would enhance the recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting opportunities available to the public.

(d) FEDERAL PUBLIC LANDS.—

(1) LANDS OPEN.—Lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, including Wilderness Areas, Wilderness Study Areas, lands designated as wilderness or administratively classified as wilderness eligible or suitable and primitive or semi-primitive areas and National Monuments, but excluding lands on the Outer Continental Shelf, shall be open to recreational fishing, hunting, and shooting unless the managing Federal agency acts to close lands to such activity. Lands may be subject to closures or restrictions if determined by the head of the agency to be necessary and reasonable and supported by facts and evidence, for purposes including resource conservation, public safety, energy or mineral production, energy generation or transmission infrastructure, water supply facilities, protection of other permittees, protection of private property rights or interest, national security, or compliance with other law.

(2) SHOOTING RANGES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency shall use his or her authorities in a manner consistent with this title and other applicable law, to—

(i) lease or permit use of lands under the jurisdiction of the agency for shooting ranges; and

(ii) designate specific lands under the jurisdiction of the agency for recreational shooting activities.

(B) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Any designation under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not subject the United States to any civil action or claim for monetary damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by any activity occurring at or on such designated lands.

(e) NECESSITY IN WILDERNESS AREAS AND ''WITHIN AND SUPPLEMENTAL TO'' WILDERNESS PURPOSES.—

(1) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.—The provision of opportunities for hunting, fishing and recreational shooting, and the conservation of fish and wildlife to provide sustainable use recreational opportunities on designated Federal wilderness areas shall constitute measures necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the wilderness area, provided that this determination shall not authorize or facilitate commodity development, use, or extraction, motorized recreational access or use that is not otherwise allowed under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), or permanent road construction or maintenance within designated wilderness areas.

(2) APPLICATION OF WILDERNESS ACT.—Provisions of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), stipulating that wilderness purposes are ''within and supplemental to'' the purposes of the underlying Federal land unit are reaffirmed. When seeking to carry out fish and wildlife conservation programs and projects or provide fish and wildlife dependent recreation opportunities on designated wilderness areas, the head of each Federal agency shall implement these supplemental purposes so as to facilitate, enhance, or both, but not to impede the underlying Federal land purposes when seeking to carry out fish and wildlife conservation programs and projects or provide fish and wildlife dependent recreation opportunities in designated wilderness areas, provided that such implementation shall not authorize or facilitate commodity development, use or extraction, or permanent road construction or use within designated wilderness areas.

(f) REPORT.—Beginning on the second October 1 after the date of the enactment of this Act and biennially on October 1 thereafter, the head of each Federal agency who has authority to manage Federal public land on which fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting occurs shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) any Federal public land administered by the agency head that was closed to recreational fishing, sport hunting, or shooting at any time during the preceding year; and

(2) the reason for the closure.

(g) CLOSURES OR SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS OF 640 OR MORE ACRES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Other than closures established or prescribed by land planning actions referred to in subsection (d) or emergency closures described in paragraph (3) of this subsection, a permanent or temporary withdrawal, change of classification, or change of management status of Federal public land that effectively closes or significantly restricts 640 or more contiguous acres of Federal public land to access or use for fishing or hunting or activities related to fishing, hunting, or both, shall take effect only if, before the date of withdrawal or change, the head of the Federal agency that has jurisdiction over the Federal public land—

(A) publishes appropriate notice of the withdrawal or change, respectively;

(B) demonstrates that coordination has occurred with a State fish and wildlife agency; and

(C) submits to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate written notice of the withdrawal or change, respectively.

(2) AGGREGATE OR CUMULATIVE EFFECTS.—If the aggregate or cumulative effect of separate withdrawals or changes effectively closes or significantly restricts 1,280 or more acres of land or water, such withdrawals and changes shall be treated as a single withdrawal or change for purposes of paragraph (1).

(3) EMERGENCY CLOSURES.—Nothing in this title prohibits a Federal land management agency from establishing or implementing emergency closures or restrictions of the smallest practicable area to provide for public safety, resource conservation, national security, or other purposes authorized by law. Such an emergency closure shall terminate after a reasonable period of time unless converted to a permanent closure consistent with this title.

(h) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE UNITS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title shall affect or modify management or use of units of the National Park System.

(i) NO PRIORITY.—Nothing in this title requires a Federal land management agency to give preference to recreational fishing, hunting, or shooting over other uses of Federal public land or over land or water management priorities established by Federal law.

(j) CONSULTATION WITH COUNCILS.—In fulfilling the duties set forth in this title, the heads of Federal agencies shall consult with respective advisory councils as established in Executive Order Nos. 12962 and 13443.

(k) AUTHORITY OF THE STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title shall be construed as interfering with, diminishing, or conflicting with the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of any State to exercise primary management, control, or regulation of fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water within the State, including on Federal public land.

(2) FEDERAL LICENSES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the head of a Federal agency head to require a license, fee, or permit to fish, hunt, or trap on land or water in a State, including on Federal public land in the States, except that this paragraph shall not affect the Migratory Bird Stamp requirement set forth in the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 113–339. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered 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, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike ''of 2013''.

Page 13, line 10, strike ''of 2013''.

Page 15, line 2, strike ''of 2013''.

Page 15, line 7, strike ''of 2013''.

Page 22, line 12, strike ''of 2013''.

Page 27, strike lines 13 and 14 and redesignate the remaining clauses accordingly.

Page 29, line 20, strike ''shall'' and insert ''may''.

Page 32, line 13, strike ''Effective'' and all that follows through line 19, and insert the following: ''Upon publication of the first notice required under section 8(c) of the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council formed in furtherance of section 441 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 1457), the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742a), and other Acts applicable to specific bureaus of the Department of the Interior is hereby abolished.''.

Page 41, lines 17 and 18, strike ''this determination'' and insert ''the provision of opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting under the authority of this title''.

Page 41, line 20, insert '', road construction or maintenance,'' after ''access''.

Page 41, lines 22 and 23, strike '', or permanent road construction or maintenance''.

Page 42, line 14, strike ''such implementation'' and insert ''the provision of opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting under the authority of this title''.

Page 42, line 16, strike ''or permanent road construction or use'' and insert ''motorized recreational access, road construction or maintenance, or use that is not otherwise allowed under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.)''.

Page 45, line 18, strike ''head''.

At the end of the bill, add the following new title (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE IX—RESPECT FOR TREATIES AND RIGHTS

SEC. 901. RESPECT FOR TREATIES AND RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to affect or modify any treaty or other right of any federally recognized Indian tribe.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes several technical and clarifying changes to the bill, and conforms the bill text to that which was favorably reported from the Committee on Natural Resources.

Let me cite just some of the small changes in the amendment:

It includes a savings position regarding the effect of the act on Indian tribes' treaty or other recognized rights. It clarifies that.

It also provides clearer language that the provision of opportunities to hunt, fish, and shoot on certain Federal lands ''shall not authorize or facilitate commodity development, use other extraction, motorized vehicle access, road construction or maintenance or use not otherwise allowed under the Wilderness Act.'' That clarifies that.

It also incorporates an amendment filed by our colleague, the sponsor of the legislation, Mr. LATTA, to title VII of the bill to correct a sunset date for the existing advisory council.

So as I understand, the manager's amendment is something that has been vetted, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I appreciate there are some clarifications in this amendment which we do support, but there are a few remaining oversights.

There was an amendment by DelBene and Kilmer from Washington State that specified that tribal jurisdiction is not to be infringed upon, where this blanket language in the Hastings amendment protecting tribal rights could well not be read. Supposedly, in a number of places here we are chasing chimeras, you know, illusions, threats, with some of the provisions about the film permitting and that.

But this might be real, which this does not deal with the potential for disputes between tribes and neighboring landowners or between tribes; and so, therefore, it would have been better to have the broader language of DelBene and Kilmer, which specified treaty-protected rights of the individual tribal members are protected, whereas this amendment only protects the rights of the tribe itself. So I worry that we are creating a loophole here that doesn't adequately protect the sovereignty of tribes and all of their members.

The amendment does attempt to address some of the wilderness issues in title VII, the so-called Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage Act, which fails to address the wilderness issues in title III, filming on public lands. We have already had extensive discussion of that. No identified problem, no hearing, nobody has ever said we need this, but it is in there. We are going to allow mechanized film crews into wilderness areas.

Then title VII creates a loophole that will allow motorized equipment and vehicles into Federal wilderness areas—now, not with permanent roads, with only temporary roads or driving off-road—to facilitate hunting in wilderness areas or otherwise restricted areas, wildlife refuges and that. And we still find that very problematic.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. HANNA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. HANNA. 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 3, before line 1, insert the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 3. REPORT ON ECONOMIC IMPACT.

Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Interior shall submit a report to Congress that assesses expected economic impacts of the Act. Such report shall include—

(1) a review of any expected increases in recreational hunting, fishing, shooting, and conservation activities;

(2) an estimate of any jobs created in each industry expected to support such activities described in paragraph (1), including in the supply, manufacturing, distribution, and retail sectors;

(3) an estimate of wages related to jobs described in paragraph (2); and

(4) an estimate of anticipated new local, State, and Federal revenue related to jobs described in paragraph (2).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the SHARE Act and am pleased to be a sponsor of this bill.

The SHARE Act allows more Americans to enjoy outdoor hobbies such as hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting on public lands. Not only do those activities provide our constituents with enjoyable hobbies and pastimes, they also contribute to our communities by creating and supporting diverse jobs in every congressional district.

When families travel and actively enjoy the outdoors, they spur demand for outdoor products and services and create jobs in the manufacturing, outfitting, retail, lodging, and hospitality industries.

□ 1515

I am proud that the village of Ilion in my congressional district is home to our Nation's oldest continually operating manufacturing company, Remington Arms. Remington manufactures firearms for hunting and recreational shooting and sustains more than 1,400 well-paying union jobs in New York's Mohawk Valley.

Legislators in Washington and in Albany should take concrete steps to support these private sector jobs, not threaten them, and I am pleased the House is taking this action today. By opening new lands for recreational use and by making the joys of the outdoors more accessible to average Americans, we can assist important sectors of our economy without spending taxpayer dollars.

My amendment would simply quantify the economic impacts of this act by detailing how the new recreational opportunities it provides will create jobs, boost wages, and generate new local, State, and Federal revenue. It is my hope that by highlighting the connection between sportsmen-friendly Federal policy and growth in outdoor industries, future Congresses will take additional steps to not only provide our constituents with greater access to hunting, fishing, shooting, and conservation pursuits but also help grow jobs in the private sector and support these American traditions.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering this amendment. I think putting this aspect into this bill will help quantify how important hunting and fishing is if you put an economic component to it. So I congratulate the gentleman.

I plan to support the amendment.

Mr. HANNA. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. I believe that the information on the economic impacts of

conservation is important. It is something that we don't quantify very well.

As we have pointed out earlier, some of the provisions of this act, unfortunately, will fly in the face of conservation, the benefits of hunting and fishing activities on public lands.

So I think, actually, on balance, the gentleman's requirement here would be very useful information in the future to help land managers who have to make decisions between opening up lands to mining or to oil and gas development versus the benefits the community could realize or has been realizing or will continue to realize from the recreational hunting and fishing.

Federal lands had become essentially a reservoir, a place where these activities are protected, for the most part, from development, with the exceptions of what I had mentioned earlier. They are some of the premiere destinations for hunting and fishing in the country.

Again, the chairman and I disagree over the merits of acquiring some of these lands which are now in private ownership from willing sellers that potentially will otherwise be slated for development, using the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I believe that addressing the Land and Water Conservation Fund proactively would have been useful.

For certain, given the objections to that—because it has not yet quite expired, even though we are underutilizing it and using the tax dollars somewhere else—the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has expired. The Dingell-Wittman amendment was proposed to reauthorize that critical program, and that was not allowed. So that would also be something that would show a measurable benefit.

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

Mr. HANNA. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to qualify and quantify the economic impact of the SHARE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. 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:

Page 27, after line 18, insert the following:

''(xiii) Women's hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organization.

''(xiv) Minority hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organization.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for considering this amendment.

Mr. Chair, this amendment concerns the composition of the Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Committee, which will advise the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior on policies and programs related to hunting and recreational activities on Federal lands. More specifically, the amendment adds a requirement that women and minority hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach or education organizations are included as discretionary committee members. Examples of such groups include the Women's Hunting and Sporting Foundation, Hispanics Enjoying Camping, Hunting, and Outdoors organization, and the African American Hunting Organization.

This will bring the number of groups in that discretionary committee group to 14 from 12.

The groups that I am adding with this amendment were originally included in the committee's charter. This amendment simply codifies their inclusion. I am proud to offer the amendment to reflect a more diverse perspective on America's land use.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. I think that his amendment, since the idea of the whole underlying legislation is to expand as much as we can to those that want to enjoy that, I think his amendment adds to the legislation, and I am prepared to support it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman, and I want to congratulate him on his diligence and on his foresight here to propose this amendment. It was an oversight in replacing the current council with a new membership. I am not exactly certain why we need to do that because we haven't heard particular complaints.

In any case, this is an improvement upon the newly recommended council to include minorities and women fully engaged, since I see a lot of those folks out in the back country in my State, and I am sure you do in Texas, too.

So I am pleased that for one brief moment here, we have a bipartisan consensus. With that, I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I thank both gentlemen and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. GALLEGO. 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 27, after line 18, insert the following:

''(xiii) Veterans service organization.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this legislation.

I can think of nothing more important that all of us, I think, can agree on than the importance of taking care of our veterans and our veterans' community, especially now that we have so many wounded warriors coming back. So many groups have taken to outdoor activities as part of the therapy for wounded warriors, making sure that we really approach making them whole again in a very real way, and nature is a huge part of that.

Last night, in fact, this Chamber held a moment of silence to honor veterans in Afghanistan and Iraq. These are folks who have put their country above all else. And what this amendment specifically would do would be to essentially correct what I believe also was an oversight in ensuring that veterans are also included in this Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee. Again, it is because so many veterans groups now in so many places are popping up where the outdoors is a great part of that therapy and a very important part of the therapy that many of our wounded warriors are receiving.

This advisory committee, as they give their advice to the administration, it is important that they do so with a veteran at the table. It is important that veterans have that voice, and they look at it with the perspective from a wounded warrior or a veteran, someone who has served our country in uniform. What is it that we can be doing to make this experience more meaningful for them?

Again, I appreciate the opportunity very much to offer the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say that this amendment, I believe, also will add to the underlying legislation, which, of course, would expand the experience of hunting and fishing. So the remarks I made to his colleague from Texas I think are applicable also to this.

So I endorse this amendment and would tell my friend from Oregon, the ranking member, that is two for two now.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Texas is batting .100 here today.

I would like to thank the gentleman for improving the proposed composition of the council. I thought your points about the healing that can come from wounded warriors being in these precious natural areas in our country is very well taken, and I appreciate that.

Not to create any discord at the moment, but there was another amendment that wasn't allowed by the Rules Committee, offered by the gentleman from California, Representative RUIZ, which is in the purview of the gentleman whose bill is on the floor today, which would have waived recreation fees for veterans with disabilities, and I hope we can revisit that issue in the future.

I congratulate the gentleman on his improvement and his recognition of our veterans.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report of 113–339.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Mr. ELLISON, who is detained at the White House, 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 38, strike line 20 through page 39, line 6.

Page 39, line 7, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(2)''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I want to applaud the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman ELLISON, for bringing this amendment to the attention of the House.

We have had endless debate about the appropriate role of the National Environmental Policy Act in both the Natural Resources Committee as well as the House Committee on Transportation.

The underlying bill, H.R. 3590, includes language which would eliminate the need for the Fish and Wildlife Service to disclose, analyze, and take comments on decisions related to management decisions in national wildlife refuges.

□ 1530

I repeat that. They would not have to analyze or take comments from either side on decisions that relate to management decisions in national wildlife refuges. Never has there been a case made here during the lead-up to this bill, such as there was, and during the debate why we need this very broad NEPA exception which would, if they want to increase hunting, no NEPA analysis, if they want to decrease hunting, no NEPA analysis, no opportunity for the public to be involved in the process.

As we learned during the shutdown, the wildlife refuge system provides a tremendous opportunity—some of it very ephemeral in terms of seasons—for duck hunters, fishermen, and other sportsmen and -women across the country. In some densely populated areas like in Congressman THOMPSON's district, wildlife refuges are some of the only hunting areas open to the public, and especially the disabled public.

Why do we need to cut the public out, including disabled Americans, veterans, anybody, regarding these special places and their management when no evidence has been presented that NEPA is in any way an impediment to refuge management? It is just the standard boilerplate: repeal NEPA anywhere, everywhere, all the time, and maybe sooner or later it might stick. But it won't, given the veto threat on this bill and the fact that the Senate isn't going to act on it. But, anyway, it is in here.

There was an amendment to be offered by Congressman BROUN from Georgia—which I was going to strongly support—which would have fixed the bill and probably brought a fair number of votes across the aisle by stripping these extraneous provisions regarding NEPA, wilderness, and everything that is under attack in this bill that doesn't need to be under attack in this bill. But I guess somehow, even though it was made in order, the Republican side has convinced him not to offer the amendment because it would have passed, and it would have made the bill better.

So at this point, at least we could support the Ellison amendment as it relates to national wildlife refuges.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess all good things come to an end because I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I oppose this amendment because it undermines what I consider to be a fundamental purpose of the law. The fundamental purpose that we are here for today is to protect our hunting and fishing traditions on Federal lands. We are making a clear statement that hunting and fishing are an important use of our multiple-use Federal lands.

This bill establishes a clear policy that Federal lands should be open for hunting and fishing unless specifically closed by a transparent and open Federal process. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman, that Federal lands should be open for hunting and fishing unless specifically closed by a transparent and open Federal process.

NEPA requires preparation of an environmental impact statement when a Federal agency proposes to take major Federal action. When H.R. 3590 is enacted in law, there will be no need for a costly and bureaucratic process currently necessary to make lands available for hunting and fishing. That process won't be necessary because it will be the law. Congress has spoken as to what the law is.

Again, this bill is designed to set out an open—unless specifically closed—process on BLM and Forest Service lands. As a result, no major Federal action would be needed or would take place to keep these lands open to these traditional important uses of our shared Federal lands.

If there is no administrative action, there is no need for an EIS or NEPA review. However, H.R. 3590 confirms an established understanding of the law that, should an agency move to close Federal lands, the agency should then undertake an open and public process before having the lands closed to our traditional uses.

Now, we know that these provisions are important because they fix a court-created problem regarding the implementation of the 1997 National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act. We have seen the clear track record that antihunter groups will use to tie up hunting and fishing access to Federal lands with endless lawsuits. This bill reverses this trend and makes our lands open for hunting and fishing. Again, Mr. Chairman, we are making the policy statement that this will be what the law of the land is.

H.R. 3590 directs that our conservation dollars be spent on conservation activities in the field rather than on redundant paperwork and, of course, endless lawsuits. That is the goal of the bill that this amendment would undercut and which would undercut our goal of promoting hunting and fishing.

I urge the defeat of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I urge defeat of 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 44, line 22, strike ''Nothing'' and insert ''Except as provided by subsection (l), nothing''.

Page 45, after line 24, insert the following:

(l) MOTORIZED VESSELS IN THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS.—The Secretary of the Interior—

(1) shall manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to allow the use of motorized vessels in a manner that is not more restrictive than the use restrictions in effect on November 21, 2013; and

(2) may manage the Ozark National Scenic Riverways to allow the use of motorized vessels in a manner that is less restrictive than the use restrictions in effect on November 21, 2013.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present this amendment to H.R. 3590 today, the Sportsmen's Heritage And Recreational Enhancement Act.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, I couldn't be prouder of the work that we have done to continue to protect our sportsmen's ability to enjoy the outdoors. As such, I am honored to offer my amendment that would ensure that sportsmen will continue to be able to use motorized vessels in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, a national park contained wholly within my congressional district in southern Missouri.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is a popular destination in Missouri for fishing, gigging, and trapping. These activities have traditionally been undertaken by individuals and families for generations. An economy has arisen in my district selling boats, motors, and other products to folks who want to gig, fish, and trap within the rivers.

Recently, the National Park Service has been discussing closing down areas of the park to motorized vessels and further limiting the horsepower of these vessels in other areas. The reduction of boat motor horsepower would limit the number of folks who could be on a boat and restrict access to families. Banning motorized vessels from areas of the park where they are currently allowed would further restrict the public's use and enjoyment of the park.

Banning motorized vessels would also exclude groups from using the rivers that simply have no other options, like the elderly and disabled veterans. Why would the Park Service resort to such drastic measures to block activities that are currently allowed? One explanation is that they don't want folks to be able to utilize the river as they have for the past decades.

My amendment would simply preserve the current park regulations as they are now and how they have been for the last five decades, preventing the Park Service from regulating sportsmen off the river. The Ozark National Scenic Riverways was created for the enjoyment of the public, and it should stay with the public.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is in the spirit of the underlying legislation, which is to make sure that there is access for hunting and fishing. And here we have, as I said in my opening statement, the potential of bureaucratic malaise, I guess, slowing down access to this particular area that the gentleman from Missouri recommends. I think his amendment adds a great deal to this legislation, and I intend to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I certainly am not an expert on the gentleman's district and what the exact issue is here; however, I do know that there has been a proposed management plan that has been out for comment since November 8. It will close on Friday. I would hope that the gentleman and concerned parties on either side of the issue have all weighed in to comment because what we are doing here today in this bill will not become law. It is already guaranteed a veto threat. The addition of this to the bill will not help resolve what is a local issue where the Park Service has to weigh comments from motorized users and nonmotorized users and then come to a conclusion weighing those comments and put forward a new management plan. That is the way this is going to get done.

It shouldn't be done from Washington, D.C. We shouldn't be dictating. If we get into every individual land use or access decision being made by every unit of the Park Service, every unit of the Fish and Wildlife Service and their refuges and every unit of the Forest Service and every unit of the BLM, we are going to be pretty busy and be embroiled in a lot of local controversy.

So this, I believe, is premature in that the comment period closes this week and the process will come to a conclusion. Comments will be weighed and a decision will be put out for final comment. It is also, at this point, being added to a bill that is going nowhere.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to clarify something, Mr. Chairman, that has been said here by my friend, the ranking member, that the administration has issued a veto threat. They have not issued a veto threat. They have said, and I will just read the last line of their Statement of Administration Policy. It says:

The administration looks forward to working with Congress to enact sportsmen and recreation legislation that addresses the concerns raised with certain provisions of H.R. 3590.

Now, in the letter they do say they have problems with four of the eight titles. But to simply suggest that the administration has issued a veto threat on this is simply not correct. And I ask—well, I will let it go.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

TITLE ____—EXEMPTIONS FOR TAKING MIGRATORY BIRDS ON CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL LAND

SEC. __01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Hunter and Farmer Protection Act''.

SEC. __02. EXEMPTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND.

Section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 704) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) EXEMPTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section prohibits the taking of any migratory game bird, including waterfowl, coots, and cranes, on or over land that—

''(A) contains—

''(i) a standing crop or flooded standing crop, including an aquatic crop;

''(ii) standing, flooded, or manipulated natural vegetation;

''(iii) flooded harvested cropland; or

''(iv) an area in a State on which seed or grain has been scattered solely as the result of an agricultural planting, harvesting, or

post-harvest manipulation practice, or a soil stabilization practice, that the head of the State office of the Cooperative Extension System of the Department of Agriculture has determined in accordance with paragraph (2) to be a normal practice in that State; and

''(B) is not otherwise a baited area.

''(2) STATE DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of a State office of the Cooperative Extension System may make a determination for purposes of paragraph (1)(A)(iv) upon the request of the Secretary of the Interior.

''(B) REVISIONS.—The head of a State office of the Cooperative Extension System may revise a determination under subparagraph (A) as the head of a State office determines to be necessary to reflect changing agricultural practices.

''(C) CONCURRENCE REQUIRED.—A determination or revision under this paragraph shall not be effective for purposes of this subsection unless the head of the State department of fish and wildlife concurs therein.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I consume.

My amendment will provide a limited exemption related to the taking of migratory game birds over farm fields. In short, it clarifies a recent interpretation by the Fish and Wildlife Service about what constitutes a ''baited field.''

In 2012, the agency warned rice growers that some of their fields that had been rolled—as farmer often do after the harvest to prepare the field to be planted the next spring—could be off limits to waterfowl hunting. That summer's drought led to an early rice harvest in several parts of the country, and heavy rainfall then caused a rare secondary ''ratoon'' crop to sprout. The Fish and Wildlife Service cautioned that should rice heads emerge in those fields, their guidelines stated that any field work, such as rolling, would make it a baited field where waterfowl hunting would be unlawful.

Waterfowl hunting is a vital industry in my State. Hunters come from the world over to Arkansas' First District, and farmers, small businesses, and the rural communities that dot the delta all rely on the millions of dollars hunters bring with them every year.

My amendment is a commonsense solution that simply states that a field may not be considered baited as the result of normal agricultural practices, as determined by the State Office of the Cooperative Extension Service at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, with concurrence from that State's Fish and Wildlife Service.

I ask for your support for this important amendment that will protect farmers from being punished for simply carrying out long-recognized and responsible agricultural practices.

With that, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I plan to support his amendment.

This is something that it seems like we wrestle with all the time here on the Federal level. There is uniqueness when you are on the ground, but yet we write rules and regulations on the one size fits all. This is clearly a unique situation, and I think the gentleman's amendment clarifies that very well.

I support the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chair, we often have conflicts in Oregon. We had a very substantial conflict relating to geese in terms of farmers' fields. The resolution was that the birds protected by the Migratory Bird Act would continue to be protected, but farmers would be able to hunt with the State license—and I don't know about the gentleman's State whether or not a State license would be required—the birds that were not migratory that were becoming pests and were resident in order to protect their crops.

□ 1545

This substantially resolved the problem.

I don't know if a similar fix would work here, but an amendment that gives an open license on the Migratory Bird Act, which has international implications, the migratory bird treaty, seems to me to be an extreme measure in this case. Therefore, we would oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. FLEMING. 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:

Add at the end of the bill, add the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 805. RESTRICTIONS ON HUNTING IN KISATCHIE NATIONAL FOREST.

(a) HUNTING IN KISATCHIE NATIONAL FOREST.—Consistent with the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 551), the Secretary of Agriculture may not restrict the use of dogs in deer hunting activities in Kisatchie National Forest, unless such restrictions—

(1) apply to the smallest practicable portions of such unit; and

(2) are necessary to reduce or control trespass onto land adjacent to such unit.

(b) PRIOR RESTRICTIONS VOID.—Any restrictions regarding the use of dogs in deer hunting activities in Kisatchie National Forest in force on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be void and have no force or effect.

(c) ADJACENT LANDOWNERS.—Landowners whose property abuts a unit of the Kisatchie National Forest may petition the Secretary of Agriculture to restrict the use of dogs in deer hunting activities that take place on such unit which abut their property. If the Secretary of Agriculture receives a petition from an adjacent landowner, the Secretary, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, may impose restrictions on the use of dogs in deer hunting—

(1) limited to those units of the Kisatchie National Forest within 300 yards of the boundary of the petitioning landowner's property; and

(2) consistent with subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

My amendment today maintains the State of Louisiana's ability to regulate hunting within its borders. In a decision announced March 1, 2012, the Forest Service Regional Forester located way over in Atlanta, Georgia, went over the heads of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and the Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries Commission to forever prohibit the use of dogs to hunt deer in Kisatchie National Forest.

Deer hunting has a long and important cultural history within the State of Louisiana. When French settlers first came to Louisiana in the 18th century, thickets and dense timber covered the area. Most of these settlers had companion dogs with them, and the most treasured companions were the deerhounds. The use of dogs helped hunters drive the deer from the woods onto trails, and the plentiful herds provided exciting sport and sound nourishment.

The 600-acre Kisatchie National Forest has provided diverse hunting opportunities for decades, including the use of dogs in hunting a variety of animals. Oddly enough, the Regional Forester does not prohibit the use of dogs for hunting raccoon, squirrel, rabbit, and game birds. The dog deer season in Louisiana has been severely restricted in recent years, down from 15 days to 7 days in 2012, and dog deer hunting in the Kisatchie has been limited to certain ranger districts.

According to communication with the Forest Service, seven Southern States allow hunting in the national forest within their borders. They include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Louisiana. However, this is the first time the Forest Service has issued a ban on dog deer hunting or hunting deer with dogs within a specific State.

According to the Forest Service documents, the revenue generated from dog deer hunting, including the care of

animals, contributes approximately 18 to 29 direct jobs and results in roughly $890,000 to $1.4 million of income from hunting tourism and related activities. By the Forest Service's own assessment, it is likely that economic benefits are currently being lost as hunters leave the area to pursue the sport elsewhere. This is having a tangible economic impact on our State, robbing it of even more jobs.

I would like to emphasize that the State of Louisiana, the Kennel Club, and Safari Club International support my amendment, and a similar amendment was accepted by the House with a voice vote last Congress.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think this is a good amendment, and I support the amendment. The primary purpose of this legislation is to limit unjustified Federal bureaucratic limitations on hunting and fishing.

I also want to make a point here that it is important to recognize that the authority of States to regulate hunting and fishing should be paramount over the Federal Government. Individual Federal agencies should not preempt State laws, and it sounds to me like that is what the gentleman is talking about in his case.

I think the amendment is a good amendment, and I support it.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about major problems confronting this Congress, and here we are now trying to resolve yet another local conflict.

After considerable complaints by private property owners about hunters encroaching on their land to retrieve their dogs that have gotten lost, driving on their land and that, the Forest Service decided because of the intermingled ownership to prohibit dog deer hunting.

Now comes the gentleman who says, well, we are going to reopen it. We will countermand the locally made decision, but we will have a new process where the private landowners can petition the secretary to re-close certain areas of the area that are now closed that he is reopening because of conflicts with their private property. However, these private property owners' petitions will have to go through the dreaded NEPA process, and that is, for deciding something as minor as that, kind of problematic.

You know, I guess maybe we should have a special day here, and I have some beefs with some Federal agencies ongoing that I would like to settle with legislation, too. Maybe we should have an open amendment process some day where every little local issue we have been dealing with with a Federal agency which is contentious between conflicting users will be decided by the United States Congress in Washington, D.C., not at the local level. That is what we are doing here. It is pretty extraordinary.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the issues brought up here.

First of all, the gentleman said there were multiple complaints. This was studied considerably. There was 1,237 responses to a request in 2009, and by October 6, we found that there were 77 percent, a clear majority of the respondents, who were actually in favor of continuing the practice of dog deer hunting. This was requested again in 2011, and there were over 1,300 respondents, and all but 16 were in favor of dog deer hunting and against the Forest Service proposed ban.

The other thing I would like to address, Mr. Chairman, is this was not a locally made decision. This was made in Atlanta. This is the problem. This has been going on for 300 years in the State of Louisiana. It is a big part of our heritage, and somebody over in Georgia, in Atlanta, representing the Federal Government, made this decision, not locally. There was no decision locally. The State supports this. The local residents support it by a vast majority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to just say that the people of Louisiana want to see this Forest Service ban overturned. This was a decision made outside of our borders. In effect, if you will, even though the people of Louisiana were asked and they gave the correct answer, it was ignored, and the decision was made by someone outside of our borders. This was a decision made by somebody in Atlanta, a Federal employee, interfering with a local issue.

This is a tradition that goes back 300 years, and I think it is pretty obvious that the people of Louisiana support the continuance of hunting deer with dogs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) ''An Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 376. An act to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, and for other purposes.

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

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. HOLT. 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:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IX—CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. 901. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO PLAN FOR A CHANGING CLIMATE.

Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to include climate change as a consideration in making decisions related to conservation and recreation on public lands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Sportsmen are among the first to notice the effects of our changing climate as changes in seasonal distribution of game and diminished natural habitats becomes more evident. As the climate continues to change, we will experience worse drought, flood, wildfire, and extreme weather events.

For public lands and recreation there, climate change will mean changes in hunting seasons, migratory patterns, and the native and invasive species populations. We will experience sea level rise, wildfire, drought, and other manifestations of climate change. All of these are altering the landscape and changing the existing opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreation on public lands. These should be considered. These will have a greater effect on sportsmen and on fishermen and hunters than all of the other things we have been talking about today.

More than 75 percent of the Federal lands are open now for recreational

hunting, fishing and shooting, but climate change would transform irreversibly, and in fact is transforming irreversibly, our public lands in ways that will limit the ability of sportsmen to enjoy recreational activities in these areas.

So this amendment says the Department should consider those things. In fact, it is even more limited than that. It says nothing will prevent the Department from considering these things. That is what this amendment is. I would hope that the House will accept this. I have been joined by a number of members of the House Sustainable Energy Coalition in offering this amendment. It is supported by Defenders of Wildlife and the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this underlying legislation is the premise that Federal lands should be open for hunting and fishing recreation rather than being closed. I believe this should be the policy of all of our multiple use Federal lands. The default option should be open regardless of whether your interests are mountain biking, rock climbing, hunting, fishing, logging, building a solar energy facility, mining, wind power, or developing oil and gas. Our Nation's multiple use lands were designed to be used for the benefit of the Nation. This open-before-closed concept is the foundation of what we are trying to do through this legislation.

□ 1600

We are trying to raise the bar of bureaucracy that the bureaucracy has placed between hunters and the outdoors.

Reckless disregard of our Nation's hunting and fishing traditions means too often our Federal lands are closed off arbitrarily, and not just without public input, but against public sentiment.

Now the gentleman is proposing that we give the Secretary another new tool to close lands, without scientific decisionmaking, without accounting for their actions. The gentleman proposes that we simply grant the Secretary the sole authority to dictate that we close off any and all of our Nation's lands from hunting and fishing based simply on the Secretary's mere opinion that hunting and fishing are a threat to our Nation's land because of climate change.

Hunting and fishing are traditions and foundations that this Nation was built upon. They are not burdens to our national lands. They are one of the many purposes of our national lands.

Just yesterday, Mr. Chairman, before the Rules Committee, one of my Democrat colleagues was commenting that he had a BB gun at age 7 and a .22 rifle at age 12. He talked about how, as a young man, he learned to respect guns and traditions. Yet that same Member is concerned about what children are learning today—the lack of respect for guns and the traditions of the outdoors.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is one of the many benefits and reasons that we are here today, to help restore the opportunity for hunting and fishing traditions to take root on our Federal lands, to remind our Federal land managers that the exercise of these traditions are not a burden on our lands but one of the foundations of our lands.

Finally, let me say this. Regardless of one's views on our climate, this amendment is not about climate change. It is about granting the Secretary a blank check to ban hunting and fishing. Nothing in the bill changes the Secretary's ability to manage our lands to ensure responsible management. The bill does require lands to be opened, however, before closed; but when closing lands, the Secretary must act in a measured fashion to ensure that our hunting and fishing traditions are protected and valued.

I urge my colleagues to reject what I consider to be an antihunting and -fishing amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the time remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who is a leader of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition Caucus and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

As the cochair of the Green Dogs of the SEEC Caucus, I rise in support of this amendment and proud to cosponsor it.

The bill before us purports to be about expanding opportunities for sportsmen on Federal lands, yet it fails to recognize the significant effect climate change will have on such opportunities. For example, what will climate change mean for hunters who are forced away from parks because of drought or threat of wildfire? As we witnessed this year, wildfire seasons are now longer, larger, and longer-term than ever before because of climate change. The migratory patterns of ducks and, for that matter, the patterns of fish, to name just two species, are also being negatively affected.

What will climate change mean for anglers who find streams drying up and killing fish? Last September, Montana officials closed the Blackfoot River—not the Secretary, they did—the iconic backdrop for the book and film, ''A River Runs Through It,'' to protect fish from the stress of low-level river flows.

Mr. Chairman, if we really want to protect and expand outdoor recreational opportunities, shouldn't we understand what climate change will mean, not only for hunters, but for the affected wildlife and their habitat?

I urge my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and advise my friend I have no requests for time. I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman is prepared to yield back.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time just to address a couple of points that my friend, the chair, from Washington has raised.

There is nothing in this amendment that gives the Secretary any new authority. It simply says that the Secretary should consider climate change in policies for managing these lands.

Climate change is the problem that needs to be addressed. You can deny it all you want, but climate change will do more to restrict hunting and fishing and recreation on public lands than these imagined administrative reductions or restrictions or lawsuits or restrictions on lead shot or any of those things.

There are a variety of adaptation strategies to promote resilience of fish and wildlife populations and forests and plant communities and freshwater resources and ocean resources. These are being studied by academic and scientific and, yes, government and nonprofit organizations.

A great deal of thought is going into this. We want to make sure that there is nothing that restricts the Secretary from using these best adaptation strategies, these best management practices, to take into account what is real. It is not imagined. The climate is changing. It is affecting the ecology of all of these public lands.

I urge support of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to point out that the gentleman wanted to clarify by saying this doesn't give authority, but the Secretary should consider. What if the Secretary considers under current law and then decides to take action?

That is the point of the argument that I made, and that is that that action, then, on climate change could cause limited or no access to our public lands. That is why I said this amendment is kind of cloaked in different clothing, because it does not speak to climate change; in fact, it speaks to the potential closing of our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' 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 New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 113–339.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. KILDEE, 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:

TITLE IX—SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SNOWMOBILES ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS

SEC. 901. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The clear identification of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use in each National Forest will improve management of National Forest System lands and protect these national treasures, enhance opportunities, and address access for motorized recreation experiences on National Forest System lands and preserve areas of opportunity in each National Forest for non-motorized travel and experiences.

(2) The sport of snowmobiling supports thousands of jobs across the country and provides a variety of enriching recreational opportunities for both families and individuals.

(3) In 2005, the Forest Service promulgated a Travel Management Rule that required travel management plans for off-road vehicles, with the exception of snowmobiles, on all lands managed by the Forest Service.

(4) Under the 2005 Travel Management Rule, the Department of Agriculture deemed that the use of snowmobiles on National Forest System lands presented a different set of management issues and environmental impacts on National Forest System lands than the use of other types of motor vehicles. Therefore, the final rule exempted snowmobiles from the mandatory designation scheme provided for under section 212.51 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, but retained the National Forest System's ability to allow, restrict or prohibit snowmobile travel, as appropriate, on a case-by-case basis.

(5) In 2013, the Ninth U.S. District Court of Idaho ruled in the case captioned as *Winter Wildlands Alliance* v. *US Forest Service*, Case No. 1:11-cv-00586–REB, ruled that the Forest Service must promulgate travel management rules that include snowmobiles. The Ninth U.S. District Court of Idaho required that the final rule be promulgated by September 14, 2014, barring no additional extension.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Forest Service should continue to allow snowmobiles access to National Forest System lands at the same levels as were allowed as of March 28, 2013, subject to closures for public health and safety at the discretion of the respective agencies, until a final travel management rule is promulgated for snowmobiles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, in 1972, President Nixon signed Executive Order 11644, which required that the U.S. Forest Service create travel management plans for the operation of off-road vehicles in our national forests, including snowmobiles. These travel management plans were designed to address the concerns of different users. They can be simple or detailed enough to affect noise, carbon emissions, traffic patterns, and protect animal migratory patterns.

In 2005, the Forest Service finalized its travel management rules for off-road vehicles in the national forest system except for snowmobiles, which were granted an exemption.

Each year, outdoor enthusiasts contribute enormous amounts to our economy, and snowmobiles support thousands of jobs not only in my district, but across the country. Not only do many of our residents enjoy snowmobiling, but it attracts significant tourism to areas like Eagle and Summit and Grand Counties and actually creates jobs in those areas.

Although snowmobiles were exempted from this rule, individual forest managers were still able to restrict snowmobile travel as appropriate on a case-by-case basis through individual travel management plans which met the unique needs of each area.

In 2013, however, a Federal District Court in Idaho in the Winter Wildlands Alliance v. U.S. Forest Service ruled the Forest Service must develop an overarching travel management rule that includes snowmobiles to comply with President Nixon's original executive order.

This amendment states that while the National Forest Service develops this travel management plan, it is a sense of Congress that the Forest Service should continue to allow snowmobiles on Federal lands during this rule's development with the same restrictions that were in place prior to the Winter Wildlands Alliance decision to ensure that the ability of snowmobilers to recreate is not interfered with because of this period where we are developing our permanent policy.

Given the breadth of outdoor activities, it makes simple sense that public lands should be available for multiple uses, including snowmobiling. About a quarter of Americans who participate in outdoor recreation enjoy motorized vehicles as part of that activity. Like other outdoor enthusiasts, snowmobilers contribute to communities by renting equipment, staying in hotels, purchasing souvenirs, enjoying local restaurants, and more.

As off-road vehicle use expands, it becomes increasingly important for the U.S. Forest Service to issue its rules to determine whether areas are open or closed to snowmobiles. This sense of Congress will allow that certainty that will allow our tourism industry to continue and our residents to continue to enjoy snowmobiling.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say on a personal note, I was looking for you on the floor at the end of last week. I was prepared to take Seattle and offer you 34 points. I think you probably would have taken that bet.

I just want to make this point. If the gentleman will say that the results on the gridiron in New Jersey last Sunday, if the gentleman will say that the better team won—and you don't have to make any other adjectives—but if the gentleman will say that, I will be more than happy to accept this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I will be happy to say on the record that the better team on that particular day won. There is still some doubt about whether that was, in fact, the Denver Broncos that took the field.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, I knew that the gentleman would find something to say.

I just want to say, dealing with the amendment, I think this amendment, again, in the spirit of adding more activity on Federal lands, I think this adds to it. I am prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the chair.

I yield to the ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I congratulate Mr. POLIS and Congressman KILDEE, who is detained at the White House, for offering this amendment.

I appreciate that the majority has accepted it. This will be a temporary provision until such a time as the final rule is adopted. There was never, I don't think, intent to have this sort of a blanket ban on snowmobiles, and this would correct that error by the Forest Service as they go through a deliberative process on where, when, and how snowmobiles will access Federal forest lands on a unit-by-unit basis.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his remarks. You know that when the defense of one team scores more points than the offense of the other team, your team is not in good shape. But I congratulate the gentleman on the 12-second, fastest ever score in a way that was quite embarrassing for the Broncos, but we will be back next year. We look forward to challenging in the NFL.

I appreciate the support from both the chair and the ranking member for Mr. KILDEE's and my amendment. This rule will help the U.S. Forest Service improve management, prevent the disruption of the tourism industry, allow for the continued enjoyment of residents in snowmobiling, and ensure that

off-road vehicles are used in a manner that protects natural resources, minimizes conflict with other users, and provides and protects motorized recreation.

Until we finalize the travel plan, snowmobilers will be able to, under this sense of Congress, enjoy their favorite activity, and communities should continue to reap the economic benefits of hosting these winter sport enthusiasts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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. MULLIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEWART, 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. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1615

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–90)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2014.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces.

Since the inauguration of President Alassane Ouattara in May 2011, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire has made progress in advancing democratic freedoms and economic development. While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress towards peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 2014.*

SHERIFF WINDERS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, last week, North Carolina lost a real leader and a good man—my loyal friend, Sheriff Carey Winders of Wayne County. He was only 57 years old.

Carey was one of the youngest men to be elected as sheriff in Wayne County, and 2015 would have marked his 20th year of service. He was dedicated to the people he served and respected by all. Carey was a lifelong member of Union Grove Free Will Baptist Church, where he met his wife of 33 years, Teresa. Family was everything to Carey. Carey had three daughters—Jessica, Ashley and Carianne—and two granddaughters.

Mr. Speaker, Carey was devoted to Wayne County and driven by his faith, his family and his commitment to the citizens who put their trust in him. While it is a dark time in Wayne County, we know that the light of his life and his principled example will illuminate this community in the days ahead.

THE GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS: THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, here we are now in February 2014, and the second session of the 113th Congress has begun. The administration still has to deal with daily headlines speaking of the disaster of—you guessed it—the Affordable Care Act. I have to sometimes refer to that as the ''Unaffordable Care Act.''

Today, the news came from the nonpartisan CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. My colleagues are all familiar with that. Their report states that the administration's rosy projections are a mere fairy tale. If you take a dive into these numbers from the CBO, Mr. Speaker, you will see last year's goals amended lower as the low participation and atrocious rollout of the exchanges have finally caught up with those estimates.

Let me just give you, colleagues, a few highlights:

The CBO lowered the estimate of exchange enrollees to 6 million. That is 1 million less than they estimated at this time last year. Now, this isn't all that surprising given the problems with the Web site—healthcare.gov—and the rest of the implementation of ObamaCare, but it definitely reinforces the notion that this plan is not working.

The CBO estimates that 31 million Americans will still be uninsured in 2024. Colleagues, when this bill was being discussed in Energy and Commerce way back in 2009—in 2008 even—the Democratic majority at the time said there were 45 million people who were uninsured. That number really shrunk down considerably when you realized that there were a number of people who were eligible for Medicaid who just didn't know it. It could have been as many as 10 or 11 or 12 million. Obviously, there are a lot of people in this country illegally uninsured but who are not eligible. Then there were the people making $75,000 a year in their households who could afford health insurance but who just chose, because of the Constitution—their personal liberty—to pay as they went. It is not something I recommend. The CBO estimates now that in 2024—10 years later—after its passage and full implementation on October 1 of this year, 2014, that there will still be 31 million Americans uninsured. What have we really solved here? It doesn't sound like we have really helped very much.

Now, this bill was sold to the American people as the solution to eliminating the uninsured. Instead, the bill only, really, adds cost in the form of very expensive mandates to everyone who already had insurance. A lot of them now are just saying, Heck, I will be one of these who will go bare. I will, maybe, set up my own savings account for health care, and will put $100 a month—or whatever—in a checking account and get a physical when I need it annually or biannually, and I will pay my own way—that has happened—and pay the little fine of $95.

So that is what is happening, and it is quite a legacy for the President's signature piece of legislation. I don't think it is the legacy that he anticipated, and it is certainly not the one that he wants today.

Finally, there is the headline from the newspaper, The Hill. Most of us read that, don't we, colleagues? We read all of these newspapers if we don't run out of time. In The Hill today, here is its headline: ''CBO: O-Care Slowing

Growth, Contributing to Job Losses''—with ''O'' standing for ''ObamaCare.''

The CBO projects that the law will reduce labor force compensation by 1 percent from 2017 to 2024, twice the reduction it previously had projected. This will decrease the number of full-time equivalent jobs by 2.3 million in 2021, and this is up from the previous estimate of 800,000. There is a big difference, my colleagues, between 2.3 million and 800,000. This is remarkable. Through a combination of higher health care costs, resulting in lower compensation and perverse incentives for folks to not work as much in order to preserve their subsidies, it is truly not the American Dream.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, continues to push for more money for jobs programs, yet, at the same time, it continues to fight for a bill that has yet to work and will lead to rewarding people for working less. What were these jobs programs? Just get rid of—what can I call it?—the worst bill, maybe, that has ever been passed in the history of this body, of this Congress. The Affordable Care Act has given us higher costs, not lower. It has performed much worse than was promised, and it will incent our citizens to work less. That is not what we want. That is really not what they want.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration to give in to reality and to let us repeal this bill. I don't think it is the first choice to just sit back and see it collapse under its own weight. You hear that expression a lot. I think that very well could happen, but let's take, maybe, a more responsible approach.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the President:

Mr. President, let's take a more responsible approach, and you work with the Congress—with Republicans and Democrats, with the House and the Senate. You get more engaged than you have ever been before, and work with us. Let's repeal it, and let's start over with something that truly does work, because we all agree that we have the greatest health care on the face of this Earth. Why is it that people pay thousands of dollars to get on a jet plane to fly from other countries to go to the Mayo Clinic or to Sloan-Kettering or to the WellStar Health System in my district, the 11th of Georgia, to get their health care, to get their surgery, to get their treatment for cancer? You don't see people from this country going in the opposite direction, because they get that good care here. So, Mr. President, we can work together. We can. The American people want us to. They don't want one side jamming the other. They do want us to work together.

I want to take some time during this Special Order hour that our Republican leadership has afforded us. I hope some of my colleagues from the House GOP Doctors Caucus will be joining me momentarily, and I will yield to them as this is the opportunity for us to explain to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle what needs to be done and how we can work together and clearly get this done and get it done in a timely fashion, if not this year, certainly in the 114th Congress.

This Doctors Caucus that I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is something that I put together a number of years ago, and we are now up to about 22 members. I say ''doctors.'' There are a lot of categories of doctors, but I am talking about doctors who work specifically in the health care space, which is one-sixth of the economy of this country. These doctors can be medical doctors. They can be dentists. They can be psychologists. They can be advanced practice nurses. Indeed, even hospital administrators are part of this group because they know. They understand that in our caucus we have, probably, 600 years of accumulated clinical experience. That means there is a little gray around the sideburns on a few of us.

This knowledge—this expertise—our leadership on the Republican side recognizes that. Our committee chairs on Energy and Commerce and on Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce—every one of those committees that has any jurisdiction over health care—understand that, and they look to us. They look to us for expertise and guidance and explanations just as we who have worked in the health care sector before we got elected to the Congress look to educators, look to accountants, look to attorneys in their previous lives to help us on issues that we are not so up to date on or on which we don't have that level of expertise. That is the way it should be, and that is the way it should be, in my opinion, on both sides of the aisle.

□ 1630

So we Doctors Caucus meet, if not weekly, at least every 2 weeks. We talk about issues. We have been talking about this Affordable Care Act for the last 3 years and going through it section by section and trying to have a thorough understanding. We bring understanding to the table, but everybody can learn something that they didn't know in a 2,700-page bill. That is the due diligence that we have done over these last several years.

When we read in the media or we hear from the Democratic side of the aisle, or either in the House of Representatives or from the Majority Leader HARRY REID and the Democratic majority in the Senate, saying, well—or even, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States. How many times have we heard him say: If you have an idea, if you have a better plan, bring it to me, bring it to me; I am all ears; I want to listen? And we have done that.

I value the opportunity to be here today to explain some of the things that have been done and that they have really come through the House GOP Doctors Caucus. One of our members is my colleague from Georgia, an orthopaedic surgeon, Dr. TOM PRICE. Dr. TOM PRICE and I served in the Georgia Senate. We are medical colleagues: he, an orthopaedic surgeon; I, an obstetrician. Now we have been in the Congress together for 10 years. And so he is a very active member of this House GOP Doctors Caucus, and he has a bill.

To just set the record straight, colleagues, let me tell you about Dr. TOM PRICE's bill, H.R. 2300, Empowering Patients First Act. Well, that bill is not 2,700 pages, but it is a comprehensive bill. A lot of the sections in that bill are individual ideas that have come from the Doctors Caucus. I am proud that he has included a number of my suggestions in regard to medical liability reform and other things. And so, it is a compendium of ideas.

It is a very good bill, a very good alternative. It is market driven. It does not interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, that sanctity, and it is a sanctity. Dr. PRICE understands that, and every member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus understands that. This bill, believe me, has the opportunity to get traction and, when it is brought to this House floor, to pass this Chamber.

Now, at the same time, we just heard, Mr. Speaker, in recent days that the Senate has drafted a bill. It doesn't have a number yet, but Dr. TOM COBURN, the OB/GYN family practitioner from Muskogee, Oklahoma, whom I have worked very closely with, the Doctors Caucus has worked very closely with, and Dr. BARRASSO and Dr. JOHN BOOZMAN. So, the Senate Republican doctors and the House Republican Doctors Caucus have worked together.

Dr. COBURN, along with Senator BURR from North Carolina and Senator ORRIN HATCH, one of the most senior and thoughtful and brilliant Members of the Senate from the State of Utah, they have this bill. They call it the Patient Choice, Affordability, Responsibility, and Empowerment Act, the acronym, Patient CARE Act from the Senate.

So, we are right there, Mr. President. With all due respect, we have ideas. We have Dr. PRICE's bill. We have Dr. COBURN's bill. We have other members of the Doctors Caucus. And the Doctors Caucus in the Senate is smaller, but we are here to help. We want to help. We truly want to bring down the cost of health care and maintain that quality that we are so proud of. It can be done. It can, indeed, be done.

Let me talk a little bit about the economy in regard to current law, PPACA, ObamaCare, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. ObamaCare has forced employers to cut hours, and as a result, part-time employment has gone through the roof. It has already forced many businesses to choose between, on the one hand, hiring new workers or providing health coverage. Mr. Speaker, they just can't do both.

President Obama always says health costs are rising at the lowest rates ever. Well, that is not because of his bill. That is because the economy is

dragging. His bill has not helped the health care industry. The costs are lower because people are not seeking care; they don't have the money. And so, yeah, sure, the overall costs of health care are going down, but that is not a good thing. That is a bad thing.

The Obama administration delayed the job-killing employer mandate for a full year so that doesn't go into effect, colleagues, until January 1 of 2015, 11 months from now. It has left the rest of Americans on the hook for this massive tax hike. The bill adds costs to running a business, massive tax increases, and of course, as I said at the outset, higher monthly premiums.

You know, one of the promises the President made, among many that he failed to keep, was that the average cost, of a health insurance premiums would be $2,500 a year lower than pre-ObamaCare.

Just the opposite has happened. And I don't think he ever said anything about what the deductible would be, Mr. Speaker. But in some of these policies, an individual deductible might go from $1,000 a year to $3,000 a year, and a family deductible from $3,000 a year to $8,000 a year. That is a 200 percent increase, a doubling of the monthly premiums. It creates just enormous uncertainty across large corporations, small businesses, and, of course, particularly the one-sixth of our economy that is the health care industry.

Think about the medical device tax and what it is doing to jobs in that industry. The medical device tax has already forced companies like Michigan-based Stryker Corporation to cut a thousand jobs. Boston Scientific canceled plans to build new facilities in the United States, instead moving these high-paying, highly technical, and innovative research jobs across the pond, overseas.

Let's look for a moment at the effect on small businesses. I speak often, and I know all of you do, too, on both sides of the aisle, because we go back home and we face our constituents; we have to, and we should. But I speak with these small business owners in the 11th District of Georgia, northwest Georgia, and my four counties. I want to know how President Obama's health care law has affected the day-to-day operations of their companies.

Well, ObamaCare has not even been fully implemented because of all these executive orders and the fiats that come down and the waivers that are granted to certain ones but not others. So ObamaCare really has not been fully implemented, even though the date is passed, but job creators and employees in Georgia and nationwide are already feeling the pain. Across the board, they have expressed frustration with its new rules and the ''moving target'' regulations, the increase in health care costs, and, of course, the uncertainty that they hate. This law has certainly created a heck of a lot of that, hasn't it, colleagues?

ObamaCare has forced employers to cut hours; and as a result of that, part-time employment has gone up, as I said a few minutes ago. It has already forced many businesses to choose, again, do I hire that 50th worker or do I just say no, I am going to take two part-time workers instead of one full-time? Or, even worse, I am going to hire that 50th worker, but I am going to drop health care coverage, Mr. Speaker, for all of my employees. And while I get a waiver for the first 30, for the next 20, I am going to pay $2,000 a year per employee that will go into the exchange.

One Georgia businessman who employs 47 people told me that ObamaCare has forced him to hire subcontractors instead of hiring new full-time employees. Another owner who has 49 workers recently purchased a robot instead of hiring new welders. That robot doesn't have to feed a family of four. It may be very efficient, but the robot doesn't have a heart and doesn't have anxiety.

On Main Street, uncertainty and higher costs get even worse when a company needs to create more than 50 jobs, as I just mentioned, creating a barrier to job creation and the expansion of their business.

ObamaCare forces employees to work fewer hours to stay on as part-time workers. It is estimated that ObamaCare will require American job creators, families, and health care providers to spend—get this, colleagues—more than 127 million hours a year on compliance. The EPA couldn't have been more onerous than this bill, and they are pretty darned onerous.

One Georgia businesswoman has been forced to hold numerous meetings on company time for her employees to help them understand the paperwork involved in trying to get health care. Besides a loss in productivity, these new rules are costing her. She recently hired an outside health care expert just to ensure she is running her company ''by the books.''

Mitzi Smith's small plumbing company in Marietta, Georgia, is known for its quality and its compassion and the excellence of its workers; and yet they are struggling to hold on, even with a wonderful reputation, because of this law.

Providing relief for taxpayers by delaying these costly mandates for 1 year is not enough, and I will continue fighting to dismantle every single piece of this train wreck law. I pledge to the people of Georgia that that is what I am going to do. It is an accountability pledge. It is not a term limit pledge. It is just to say, Look, I am not up here to be a potted plant. You have hired me to be your voice to speak for you on issues like this one. There are others. But I think now, as we approach the elections of 2014, what is more important than putting people back to work and providing them assurance that they can keep their doctor, they can keep their hospital, they can keep the health care that they want, not larded up with a bunch of funded mandates, really, that are causing those premiums to go up that they don't need and they don't want?

□ 1645

It is a one-size-fits-all. And in health care, one size, colleagues, and you know this, one size doesn't fit all.

I mentioned a few minutes ago about the excise tax, the 2.3 percent on medical devices. Let me mention a couple of companies that have been in touch with my office concerning this issue.

Smith & Nephew medical company announced in February that it will lay off almost 100 workers in their Tennessee and Massachusetts plants.

Cook Medical, a very familiar name, has canceled plans to open five, count them, five United States factories because the tax, this medical device tax, would cost them $20 million a year in the coming years. And remember, colleagues, this medical device tax is not on their profits. This is a tax on their revenue, so it is much more onerous than if it were just a tax on their profit.

Boston Scientific, planning for a more than $100 million charge against earnings in 2013, has now built, get this, a $35 million research facility in not Boston, but in Ireland, and is building a $150 million factory in China.

Stryker Corporation, based in Michigan, blames the tax for 1,000 layoffs.

Zimmer, based in Indiana, is laying off 450 people and taking a $50 million charge against earnings.

Medtronic, one of my classmates from Georgia Tech was the CEO of Medtronic, brilliant man, retired now, but I will never forget him. He was brilliant at Georgia Tech and throughout his entire career, and he was the CEO at a time for Medtronic. They make heart valves and many lifesaving medical devices. They expect an annual charge against earnings of $175 million.

Covidien has cited the tax in explaining 200 layoffs and a decision to move some production to Costa Rica and Mexico. I have nothing against Costa Rica or Mexico, great countries, great people, but, you know, when we are looking at an unemployment rate of 6.7 percent—if you believe that, it is probably closer to 15 percent when you count all the people that have just given up. They have been unemployed for over a year and they are just out of it, they are not even counted anymore.

So, I could go on and on and on and give you examples. I will give you one more.

A Guthrie, Oklahoma, Taco Bell has cut its full-time employees' hours to 28 per week or less. If you had a job and you got to work 28 hours a week, colleagues, I don't know about y'all, but I would need three of those jobs to support my family and my children and help support my grandchildren.

Former employee Johnna Davis said, and I quote Johnna, ''They informed everybody,'' the company, ''that nobody was considered full-time any longer . . . that everybody was now

considered part-time, and they would be cutting hours back to 28 or less due to ObamaCare.''

Spiritwear, an Idaho-based clothes company that specializes in licensed college and football team colors and logo apparel is poised to more than double their business this year.

Mr. Speaker, that is great news, isn't it?

However, the company is on the cusp of having 50 full-time employees. She is upset that what seems to be her best solution, hiring independent contractors, would give her less control—and it would—over worker hours and how much involvement they can have in other parts of the company.

Darden Restaurants, parent company of such well-known and very good restaurants as Olive Garden and Red Lobster and Longhorn Steakhouse, they tested making some workers part-time last year. The chain has decided not to make all full-time workers part-time, but it has not ruled out a broader shift toward that very thing, part-time work.

Then in January 2014, Target announced that they would no longer provide health care coverage for their part-time employees.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have some time left, but I think, colleagues, that you get the picture here. We have a real problem right here in River City—and by that, I mean the Nation's Capitol, but I also mean the entire country—and we have to do something about it.

We can't just keep kicking the can down the road, as we have done with Medicare and Social Security, needed reforms, protections, strengthening to make sure that these programs are there for our children and our grandchildren.

But here we have created a whole new entitlement program that really, when you look at it, it is punishing both our seniors and our young because it is forcing the young people who finally reach that 27th birthday, and they can no longer, now, be on their parents' health insurance plan. Maybe they have been living at home, post-college, and the parents have finally just said, Honey, you are just going to have to move out. We need our space. We need a little privacy.

These young people have a job, and they want to move out with a friend or someone that they went to school with. They want to move on with their lives. They are adults now, and they have got a job, and they find that, to get health insurance, it is astronomical. Yet the salary that they make, their entry-level salary, is too much to make them eligible for a subsidy.

So what are they going to do? They are going to pay that fine, that $95 fine, and maybe even when it gets to $600, they are going to pay that, and they are going to go bare. I use that as an expression of being not having health insurance coverage. They may be 10-foot tall and bulletproof. They may take care of themselves. They may not do skydiving and some risky sort of behavior. But you never know when that Mack truck is going to run you down and you are going to end up in the emergency room.

So we want to make sure we get this right. So far we have gotten it totally wrong. But we can do better. We will do better. We need to do it in a bicameral, bipartisan way.

I mentioned my colleague, Dr. PRICE, and his bill. I mentioned my other colleagues on the House GOP Doctors Caucus as we continue to work on things, my cochair, Dr. PHIL ROE, a fellow OB/GYN from Tri-Cities, Tennessee, former mayor of Kingsport or Johnson City. We can do it and we will do it.

But, Mr. President, you said, if you like what you have, you can keep it. You also said, if anybody, Member of Congress, has a better idea, bring it to you and you will consider it. Well, I have mentioned two bills here tonight. We have other ideas, and you have 2½, almost 3 years left in your second term. You want a legacy? We are going to help you have a legacy, and a good one, but you have got to work with us. It is a two-way street.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and this great deliberative body that we are part of. I appreciate the delivery of Mr. GINGREY a little bit earlier.

I wanted to take us, if I could direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the situation in the Middle East. And we know that the implication in our Constitution is that the President conducts the foreign policy. I would teach that class if I had the time, and I don't disagree with that.

But also, this Congress has responsibility. We have responsibilities, for example, that are specific within the enumerated powers of the Constitution. And if anyone thinks that the House of Representatives or the United States Senate or Congress itself, as a body, doesn't have a voice on foreign policy, I would direct them to the enumerated power of the power to declare war.

Certainly, we have also foreign policy responsibilities here, and we appropriate funds for foreign aid and a good number of other resources that go to help out countries that are either our allies or hopefully will become our allies one day. There is a lot that we do that has to do with foreign policy. We have a Foreign Affairs Committee. We have a Select Committee on Intelligence. We have Armed Services. All of those things are committees that deal with issues that have to do with our foreign relations and our foreign policy.

So, because of that, Mr. Speaker, a number of us in this Congress have taken a responsibility to step forward and be engaged in foreign policy, and also to have a voice and be better informed than simply letting the message come from the White House.

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AND THE DROUGHT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I see that my friend from Utah has just filed the rule, and I appreciate the gentleman from Utah, not only what he has done here today, but his leadership. I want to take a moment to make the message here as the topic that is coming up now is a rule that was referenced by the gentleman from Utah about the San Joaquin Valley and the drought in California.

I have traveled out there, and I have been there to see about 250,000 of 600,000 acres that were manmade drought. And now we have nature-made drought that is coupled with the manmade drought, and I intend to support the legislation that comes to the floor tomorrow.

I thank especially the California delegation for leading on this and helping the rest of the country understand how important the water issues are around the country.

I have worked with water and water management all of my professional life, and these issues come close to home when you either need water or you can't get rid of it. And that is what this bill is tomorrow. It is about needing water and directing it to the best resources.

But if I would, Mr. Speaker, revert back to the topic at hand, and that is the topic of the foreign policy and the very solid constitutional claim that Congress has to be engaged in foreign policy, to help manage that foreign policy and to appropriate resources to foreign policy.

To that end, a number of us in this Congress, and not nearly enough of us, have been involved in foreign policy and free trade agreements and traveled to a good number of countries to engage with people in other parts of the world to help stitch together and knit together our relationships that are so important.

□ 1700

So if I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first paint the big picture of what the world looks like. I will offer a little bit of history first and then paint a picture of how the globe looks today.

I will take us back to World War II, which was the most dramatic shift in power that the world has seen, at least

in my understanding of history. We saw the clash of the Imperial Japanese and the Nazi regimes that threatened to swamp the entire world. Having fought back a world war on two fronts, in Asia across the Pacific and in Europe, here in America, we see this as the time that America rose to become a superpower. As we saw then, immediately after World War II, we saw the Cold War begin, and the Soviet Union formed as a product, a part at least, a product of World War II, clashing with the United States in that Cold War that lasted for 45 years.

It was two different ideologies. It is free enterprise, capitalism, it is God-given liberty challenged up against the forces of the former Soviet Union, which were atheistic and communistic and a managed economy from top down.

We saw what happened. We saw how that was resolved, Mr. Speaker.

It was described, I think, best by Jeane Kirkpatrick, who was the Ambassador for Ronald Reagan to the United Nations, when she said, some time around 1984, as she stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations, she said, What is going on in the world, in this Cold War, in this clash, this competition between the two huge ideologies, what is going on between the Soviet Union and the United States is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. And the question is, Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically in the Monopoly part of the game before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States of America in the chess component of the game?

Monopoly and chess on the same board. The Russians, building missiles and expanding their military capability and trying to outdo the United States to the point where we would have to capitulate while we were pushing our economy. This growing, dynamic free enterprise economy was competing against the managed economy, the communist economy of the Soviet Union.

And what happened was, the monopoly game, the monopoly winners won out, and the Soviet Union was bankrupted, and because of that, the country collapsed and imploded upon itself around about 1991, and they had to reform back around to—they could say former Soviet Union, Russia—Russia and some of its federation countries, safer for the world because that clash of the two huge ideologies has been diminished significantly. The threat of a nuclear war has been diminished significantly thanks to Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, Pope John Paul II, and some will say Gorbachev.

Those four personalities engaged together were the leadership that brought about the dynamic that brought an end to the Cold War. In the aftermath of the Cold War, there were those sitting around—cold warriors—to celebrate the end of the Cold War, a victory for the free world. Not only the United States, but our allies. A victory for the free world,

As they celebrated, they got ready to raise their glasses, one of them, one of them said, Just a minute. Don't be too soon to celebrate because think of this: The world will not long tolerate a lone superpower. There will be allegiances and alliances made that you have not imagined that will line up against the United States, and if those forces line up against the United States—and they will—we will find ourselves with competition and enemies that we have not seen before in the world. Some of those will be an alliance that does include Islamic nations lined up against the United States.

That statement was made in the late part of 1991, I believe it was, and that would be at least a decade, roughly a decade before the attack on the United States on September 11, 2001. That very prescient comment that was made before they celebrated the end of the Cold War, before the glasses went up, Mr. Speaker, there was a realization that we would have new enemies that would form, and they would form coalitions against us.

So because of that, we should be aware of where we are today. Those enemies that have formed against us, a lot of them have been radical Islamists that have decided that they want to kill Americans because they disagree with our ideology. We should not believe that somehow it is just a matter of, we live in one place on the globe, and others live in another place, and we end up at war with each other with people trying to kill us. That is not the circumstances in that way.

Instead, it is competing ideologies. People that have a different belief system. People that believe that they need to have enemies so that they could demonize those enemies and mobilize their people, and if they can mobilize their people against a demonized enemy, they have a better chance of hanging onto power.

Those are the circumstances in Iran, where they describe the United States of America as being ''the great Satan,'' and it is the public policy of Iran to declare America to be the great Satan. They teach it in their schools, and they are spinning centrifuges for the purposes of developing nuclear weapons and a means to deliver them. The President has contended that his negotiations with Iran have slowed down their nuclear weapons effort, and perhaps they will be able to talk Iran into stopping their nuclear efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I will take you back to September of 2003, where I sat in on a meeting with Ambassadors to the United States from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, and they sat around with a group of Members. The discussion was about whether we should open up negotiations with Iran on their nuclear capability, and after I listened to the three of them and every Member that was around that table, of which there were not very many. I was the low man on the seniority totem pole at the time. I had to wait my turn to speak, of course. Then I asked the Ambassadors, Why are you here? What is your objective in meeting with us to have this discussion about opening up negotiations or a dialogue with Iran? Their answer was, We want to you open up dialogue with Iran so that you can help us because we think that our three countries—France, the United Kingdom, and Germany—at the table with the United States, we have a chance of convincing the Iranians not to continue any further with their nuclear endeavors. September 2003.

I listened to that response, and I said, If we open up negotiations or open up dialogue with Iran, what are you prepared to do, then, if we take step one into these negotiations? Their answer was, We want to open up dialogue. That is our objective, as if there wasn't a step two, three, four, or five.

But we know that once you have opened up the dialogue, you have to be willing to follow through with something. So I said, If the United States steps up to negotiate with Iran, and it is clear that they have an objective to develop a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it, if the United States steps up and opens that dialogue, then you are suggesting that we enter into formal negotiations. In those negotiations, you understand that if we fail to convince Iran that they should stop nuclear development, are you prepared, then, to go to the United Nations for a resolution? Are you permitting sanctions against Iran? If the sanctions aren't effective, are you prepared to blockade Iran? If you are prepared to blockade Iran, and the blockade is not effective, and they continue to develop a nuclear weapon, and somebody has got to step up to that line in the sand with men and equipment and munitions and military supplies and put blood on the line along with the treasure, are you prepared to step up to that line in the desert sand? Of course the Ambassadors were real nervous about that discussion long before I got to the part about the line in the sand in the desert.

As they expressed their will, which was, Let's just open up dialogue, they had to also recognize that when you open up dialogue, you start down the path of dialogued negotiations, United Nations resolution, sanction, blockade, and eventually, if Iran is committed, there is going to be a showdown.

I said to them, You see, if we start down this path, we have to be prepared to follow all the way through, and let's understand that we are prepared before we start because I will tell you that Iran is committed to developing a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it. They are committed. It isn't just a feint on their part. It isn't just a motion in that direction. They are committed, and if we aren't committed to go all the way to putting that line in the sand and lining up on that line in

the sand and following through—and I said these words this way—then Iran will play us like a fiddle, and when this is all done, they will have their nuclear weaponry, and they will have their means to deliver it, and we will just look like a bunch of foolish negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this up because now here we are, these 10-plus years later. Iran is in a position where they would like to have the rest of the world think that they have slowed down and maybe given up on their efforts to develop nuclear. They still take a public position that they never really were developing a nuclear weapon, that they were just enriching uranium for the purpose of generating electricity in their oil-rich country. Of course no one should have ever bought that from the beginning.

But our administration seems to think that if they negotiate in good faith, the Iranians are going to negotiate in good faith. I think it indicates some naivete about the minds of the people that want nuclear weapons.

A nuclear weapon capability is far more valuable to Iran in their negotiations than talking nice to the United States. Especially, why do they care about us four friends if they are teaching their children to hate us? If we are the great Satan, they don't have a lot to gain in public opinion in Iran by talking to the United States.

So we should understand their motives. Their motives are to dominate that part of the world with a nuclear capability to threaten that part of the world. They have already said that they have targets chosen in the United States. That is an Iranian public position today, and if you look at the method that they could have to deliver a nuclear weapon, which might only be weeks or months away—

We can have inspectors in Iran that are examining anything that we want to examine, but that doesn't mean the Iranians don't decide that they are going to throw a public relations tantrum and kick all of the inspectors out of Iran and only be 2 or 3 months from having that nuclear weapon.

So they can choose now when the time is right for them, when the time is right for them politically to make that move. Even if they have slowed this down and even if they are not putting more centrifuges in place, the question is, are they still spinning? What happened to the enriched uranium? Even if they dilute their enriched uranium down below 20 percent, it is another chemical reaction to enrich it again—it doesn't take very long—at best, they have slowed their operations down in order to pick up $4 billion or more into their economy that they need. Their economy is suffering because of the sanctions.

So we are being played again. It is just part of the fiddle. We are being played like a fiddle. We have been played like a fiddle for the last 10 years. The conviction and the resolve from our leaders isn't strong enough, and I have said from this floor, Mr. Speaker, that if I were the lead guy, the lead person on negotiations with Iran—and I will just take us back to the Ahmadinejad era so we can think of the personality on the other side of that—we would do it this way:

I would just simply back-channel information probably through the Swiss in the diplomatic channel, back channel in to the Ahmadinejad and the mullahs, and it would be this, presuming that I were calling the shots here on foreign policy.

It would be, Mr. Ahmadinejad and Iranian mullahs, I have decided—we, here in the United States—but I have decided the date beyond which you will not be allowed to continue your nuclear endeavor, and I have taken the liberty to put an ''X'' on the calendar that sets that date. Now, you don't know that date, but I do, and beyond that date, you will not be allowed to continue your nuclear endeavor whatsoever it takes to do so, and it will be dramatic, and the world will know. You will certainly be the ones to get the first announcement because that is when the kinetic action starts. That is the implication—not the word.

Then I would say, But, you know, if you hustle up and decommission and tear down your nuclear development equipment and you do that with our inspectors to our satisfaction or with an intermediary that we can trust, we will help you with that, and we will help you with some resources to do so. We will even help you with public opinion so that you can save face as you back up from this clash of civilizations that is bound to come if we let you go down this path.

Again, Mr. Ahmadinejad, you don't know that date, but I do, and we can forestall the inevitable if you decommission and tear this down. But you have got to mean it. It can't be a bluff. It has got to be a real ''X'' on the calendar. It has got to be a real date. Maybe no one else knows it. Maybe only the leader of the free world knows that date. But he has got to mean it.

Short of that, we get played like a fiddle, and here we are, stretching this thing out again, with the world an ever more dangerous place in that part of the world. I can stand there and listen to the intellectuals and say—Europe, for example, and I mentioned the foreign travel, and listen to them say, Well, of course a nuclear capable Iran is preferable to a military strike to take it out. They utter that in the same fashion that people in this country would utter, Well, of course it is the CO_2 emissions from U.S. industry that is one day going to cause the Earth's temperature to go up, as if somehow that was the conventional knowledge that was accepted by everyone.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I reject that way of thinking. The idea that a nuclear-capable Iran is peripheral to a military strike to take it out isn't a rational conclusion that one can draw. You have to start with a flawed premise to get to that conclusion and say it is rational. There are a lot of rational conclusions that are built upon false premises, I might add, and that would be one.

A nuclear-capable Iran threatens all of the Middle East. Their immediate target would be Tel Aviv. And Tel Aviv, by the way, is not very highly populated with anything other than Jewish people, which would be their ideal target. So it is a short missile strike from Iran to Tel Aviv. They know that. They certainly know that in Israel. And today what they know is they don't have the level of confidence that the United States is standing quite as strongly next to Israel as we have in the past. That message has been sent by our President in our foreign policy for some time.

The idea that Israel should go back to the '67 borders, as if somehow the '67 borders were defensible, well, they were defended in '67 and they were defended in '73, but they expanded their defensive borders because of that. Israel traded some land for peace. It didn't work out very well. The Gaza Strip is a place to launch attacks on the Israelis from Lebanon, and Hezbollah is occupying large chunks of Beirut in Lebanon. That becomes a place where there are now some tens of thousands of missiles that are lined up there aimed at Israel, an ever more dangerous place.

Somehow we think that we can talk nice to the Iranians and they are going to treat us nice and somehow good reason is going to get something accomplished with negotiations. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare to ever see a diplomatic error take place in negotiations. Instead, you have to have leverage, and that leverage is going to be economic, military, or perhaps political. It could come mostly from other entities. If you don't have those forces in place and something that you can give, do, or give up, you are not going to just get, well, we like you, Mr. President, and you said that if we unclenched our fist, you will extend your hand. I didn't see Iran unclench its fist, but I saw our hand extended. And some of our hand was played, and some of our hand—or whole cards have been seen now and shown to the other side. It is a very, very dangerous proposition.

Looking over there in the same neighborhood as Syria, it became the issue du jour that Syria had weapons of mass destruction. It is hard to make the case in this Congress that Syria had weapons of mass destruction, that, of course, none of them came out of Iraq, because it is conventional belief over on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction, regardless that Saddam gassed his own people, regardless that we did secure yellowcake uranium in Iraq. We did take it out of Iraq

and transport it across the Atlantic Ocean, down the St. Lawrence Seaway and up to Canada so it could be converted into power generation. In spite of all that, nobody seems to think that any of that could have gotten across the border or any weapons of mass destruction, such as gas, could have gotten across the border into Syria, even though we all agree that Assad used gas against his own people.

We would like to put an end to that. But once the President showed his hand on that and the British lost the vote on the floor—I believe it was in the House of Commons—the President came to Congress and said, well, now I want to strike Syria, and why don't you give me the authority to do that? That was an implied directive, Mr. Speaker, not a direct one, not a formal one. It was clear that neither the House nor the Senate had an appetite to go into military action in Syria.

So we fell back on Putin and the Russians to be the negotiators with the weapons of mass destruction in Syria. We saw the promise that the gas was going to be accumulated, picked up and transported out of Syria by the end of the year. That was the end of last year, not the end of this year, Mr. Speaker. So now it is going to take perhaps another 6 months and another and another and another.

It is a static position in the world now where Syria has digressed down to the point where it is hard to find a friend in Syria. The President said here in this very Chamber at his State of the Union address last week that we are going to oppose the regime and we are going to support our friends in Syria. It is hard to find friends in Syria. This conflict may have gotten to the point where there is nobody. Neither side is a side that is either going to support us or one that we should support. My message is that Syria has devolved downward into a very difficult, static, and ugly situation with a lot of blood and death that threaten to spill over.

Of course, we have the nuclear threat that has slowed down but not necessarily been suspended in Iran. In the rest of our foreign relations around that part of the world, we are 2½ years or more into the Arab Spring, and in almost every one of those changes—some regime changes, some civil war, and some that reached a static impasse—the result of that hasn't been favorable to U.S. interests, and you can go country after country, the conflicts around.

So several Members and I took a trip over into that part of the world right before Christmas to assess the situation. We need to do that because assessing the situation from here, it turns out that there is a lot of information that is not very reliable that comes out of the White House and the State Department with regard to that part of the world. So we traveled into Egypt, into Lebanon, into Libya, and into Israel, among other places. We met with their top leaders in most all of those countries and on down the line. Of course, we met with our State Department and got the in-country briefing.

It works out that the short version is that Lebanon is a mess. I think it is intractable, and I don't know how you resolve it. In Libya, the civil war didn't resolve it. The radical militant Islamists still control Benghazi, and it is not safe enough to go there for their government, let alone for representatives of our government. So Libya is at an impasse. They would like to be able to put together a functioning government in Libya, and I am impressed with some of the people that are in leadership there. But if they can't control Benghazi, Benghazi militants can come in and threaten Tripoli, for example, and have.

Egypt, though, Mr. Speaker, has turned, I think, in a very good and positive direction in that they rose up and threw Morsi out. Morsi—the face and the voice of the Muslim Brotherhood in the country of the origin of the Muslim Brotherhood—was rejected by the Egyptian people, and 30 to 33 million of 80 million Egyptians went to the streets mid last summer to demand that Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood be taken down and out of the government. It was a popular uprising. And with the pleadings of the popular uprising, then you saw the Egyptian military take charge. We have met with them, myself eye to eye at least twice and at different levels within the government and two different trips over there.

They have written a constitution, one that protects even Christian religious interests there and commits resources to rebuilding our burned churches in a place like Egypt. They have ratified a constitution in that election the 14th and 15th of January. Now you have elections set up for a parliament, and behind that, a Presidential election. I expect we will see a legitimate civilian government in Egypt sometime in less than a half a year. At that point, the voice of the Egyptian people at least is structured to be heard through the government, a relatively new experience for the Egyptians.

So there is a lot that has been turning in the world, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned the threat to Israel, that we need to stand more closely with them, shoulder to shoulder, and make an even stronger commitment to support them. They are going to have to face up to and they are going to have to decide if they have to take action against an existential threat, which is a nuclear-capable Iran.

We need to decide whom we are going to be friends with. It is not the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. Even though it looks like this administration has lined up with the Muslim Brotherhood, it is not the Muslim Brotherhood. The American people don't support the Muslim Brotherhood, and they don't support the militant wings and arms that are components of the Muslim Brotherhood and those affiliates of those militant wings and arms that might say they are not but operate in concert, especially in places like Syria.

We need to understand that this world is lined up to some degree against us. We have had friends in that part of the world that go back deep and long. Egypt is one of those countries. It was 1954 when President Eisenhower made it clear that he was going to stand with the Egyptian people. We have had them as allies, and we have worked military operations in the Sinai for a long time. We need to restore those relationships with the Egyptian people and I think the soon-to-be-legitimized civilian government of Egypt. We need to let people know, like the United Arab Emirates, that we are going to stand with them as they are going to stand with us. We want to stand with the moderate interests in the Middle East that want to engage in petroleum production, diplomacy, and the growth of their own economies.

We have had a good strong interest in the Middle Eastern part of the world, and it has been fractured time after time after time by the results of radical Islamists and Muslim Brotherhood coming into these countries throughout this long, long period of the Arab Spring, summer and fall times 2.5.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is looked to by the rest of the world to lead. That means we need to have a strong State Department, a strong foreign policy, and a clear and coherent moral message. It has got to be that we stand with our friends. We should understand that just because there is an election in a country, that doesn't mean that democracy is going to be manifested or it is going to be the solution.

Mr. Speaker, we need a stronger foreign policy, we need more Members of this Congress taking an interest, and we need a President that gets it right.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2954, PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3964, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY EMERGENCY WATER DELIVERY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–340) on the resolution (H. Res. 472) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3964) to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes, which was referred to

the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2642. An act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 5, 2014, 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:

4649. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding a report on the number and characteristics of members of the Armed Forces serving on Active Duty who were diagnosed with breast cancer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4650. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4651. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations, Elko County, NV, [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4652. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Golden Parachute Payments (RIN: 2590-AA08) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4653. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Executive Compensation (RIN: 2590-AA12) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4654. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of a proposed lease with the Government of Sweden (Transmittal No. 03-14) pursuant to Section 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4655. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4656. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4657. A letter from the Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting three reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4658. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4659. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a letter reporting that the Office of Government Ethics did not conduct or initiate any competitions in FY 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4660. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period April 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4661. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the period between January 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4662. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Danville, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0657; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-24] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4663. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sisseton, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0641; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-7] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4664. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30933; Amdt. No. 3568] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4665. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0811; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-41-AD; Amendment 39-17715; AD 2013-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4666. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1004; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-34-AD; Amendment 39-17719; AD 2013-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4667. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Chariton, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0255; Airspace Docket No. 13-ACE-4] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4668. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gainesville, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0586; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-11] received January 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4669. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled ''Review of Medicare Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2011''; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and 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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3964) to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–340). 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. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 3986. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust the phaseout of the health insurance tax credit for geographic variations in the cost-of-living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3988. A bill to supplement the Secretary of the Army's existing authorities to review the operations of reservoirs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 3989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a deduction for amounts contributed to disaster savings accounts to help defray the cost of preparing their homes to withstand a disaster and to repair or replace property damaged or destroyed in a disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3990. A bill to prevent and mitigate identity theft, to ensure privacy, to provide notice of security breaches, and to enhance criminal penalties, law enforcement assistance, and other protections against security breaches, fraudulent access, and misuse of personally identifiable information; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. SMITH OF NEBRASKA (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 3991. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.J. Res. 108. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 473. A resolution expressing support for designation of February 4, 2014, as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

171. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 571 memorializing the Congress to pass and the President to sign the Marketplace Fairness Act of 2013; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 3986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 & 18

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 3987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 3988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: 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 or Office thereof.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 3989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 3991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 32: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 104: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 149: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 164: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 184: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 279: Mr. DENHAM and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 311: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 383: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 411: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 455: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 486: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 543: Mr. PETERSON and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 594: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 795: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 831: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 920: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 946: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1010: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1070: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1091: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 1141: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1179: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1249: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1250: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1381: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 1423: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1528: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1563: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 1692: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1696: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1726: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1750: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1761: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 1771: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1775: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1779: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1798: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1801: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1821: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1857: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H.R. 1953: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1998: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2028: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2203: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2261: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 2300: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 2305: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2376: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2387: Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. MENG, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2451: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2470: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2506: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2509: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2553: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2575: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
H.R. 2591: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2656: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2662: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2737: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2780: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2841: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3040: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3121: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3211: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 3303: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 3306: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3310: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3331: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3338: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 3344: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3395: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3461: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3488: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3505: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3522: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3530: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3541: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 3546: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3555: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3563: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3576: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 3590: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MICA, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3600: Ms. BASS, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3608: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3658: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3689: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 3725: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 3774: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3775: Mrs. ELLMERS.
H.R. 3790: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 3829: Mr. JONES, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3837: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 3854: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3857: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3865: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3914: Mr. MORAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 3921: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 3930: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROONEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3933: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3969: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3972: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3973: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3979: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 3982: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H. Res. 36: Mr. DENHAM.
H. Res. 55: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 231: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H. Res. 283: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 284: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 302: Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 418: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 428: Mr. MASSIE.
H. Res. 440: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 442: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARR, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MICA, and Mr. FINCHER.
H. Res. 447: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 456: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. NUGENT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GRIJALVA, or a designee to H.R. 2954—To authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative NAPOLITANO, or a designee to H.R. 3964 the Sacramento-San Joaquin Emergency Water Delivery Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.