

Shackleford Banks Horse Herd signed in January 2006 (or any successor management plan).

(c) NO LIABILITY CREATED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating liability for the United States for any damages caused by the free-roaming wild horses to any person or property located inside or outside the boundaries of the refuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

In 2007, the State of North Carolina, the County of Currituck, the Corolla Wild Horse Fund, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service signed a comprehensive wild horse management plan for the colonial Spanish mustangs that live on 7,500 acres of private and public lands in North Carolina. This plan expired last year, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicated that it will not sign a new agreement.

H.R. 126, authored by Congressman WALTER B. JONES, requires the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a new agreement within 180 days of enactment. It will also cap the number of horses to no more than 130, allow the introduction of a small number of Shackleford Banks horses to improve genetic diversity, and will ensure that the Corolla Wild Horse Fund, which is a volunteer organization, will continue to pay for the cost of caring for and managing these horses in the future. These horses are living symbols of our colonial history. H.R. 126, which is a similar bill to one that passed the House by a voice vote last year, will ensure their survival at no cost to the taxpayers.

I urge adoption of the measure and compliment the author for his tireless leadership and his passion for this issue and reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 126 directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Corolla Wild Horse Fund, as well as local and State authorities, to provide for the management of the wild horses in and around the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge. The agreement will increase the cap on the herd size and specify that the privately funded Co-

rolla Wild Horse Fund will cover the cost of managing the herd.

This refuge was established in 1984 to preserve and protect the native coastal barrier ecosystem. The refuge provides habitat for the migrating wild fowl and for the endangered species, such as piping plover and sea turtles.

It is unusual to protect a nonnative species such as these horses in a wildlife refuge. Extra effort and resources are needed to ensure that the herd does not impair the ecosystem for the native animals and plants.

H.R. 126 is an imperfect solution, though a solution, to a very difficult problem. We must continue working with Fish and Wildlife Service and with the local community to achieve balance between the needs of the refuge and these wild horses.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their words today, and I'll take just a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been said by both, this is a plan to maintain and protect a part of North Carolina's history. As Mr. WITTMAN said, these horses have been traced back by genetic experts to the Spanish mustangs that swam ashore in the 1600s. They are really part of our heritage.

These beautiful little horses roam, as has been said by both sides today, over 7,500 acres of public and private land. This is in Currituck County out at Corolla.

□ 1700

These little horses are so special that the citizens of our area decided that they should try to create a foundation where they could work together with the Federal Government, the State government, and the county government; and it's known as the Corolla Wild Horse Fund. It is a nonprofit. These people are absolutely convinced and committed to making sure that for years to come down the road that these little horses will still have the ability to reproduce. And that's been part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that if you allow this herd to get down to about 60 horses, you will not be able to maintain the diversity of the herd.

That is why an expert, Dr. Gus Cothran of Texas A&M, as has been said in the comments by both sides, has said that you have to have a minimum of 120 horses but no more than 130. We are of the firm belief that H.R. 126 will do what is necessary to continue to make sure that we have a viable herd of these horses that have been traced back to the Spanish galleons that came to the coast of North Carolina and wrecked and these horses swam ashore. They've been able to live for that many years.

This is very close to legislation, and I want to thank the House in a bipar-

tisan way, in 1998 we did the same thing that we are trying to do in Corolla down in Currituck County down at Shackleford Banks. And what was interesting, President Clinton was President at the time, and Erskine Bowles was Chief of Staff to President Clinton, and Erskine Bowles got behind the legislation, and that's exactly what we're trying to do. It was the Park Service down at Shackleford Banks; this is Fish and Wildlife, but thank you for your comments.

I want to thank the chairman for his comments because there's no reason that we cannot make both sides happy to do what needs to be done and to protect what, to me, when you look at this beautiful little horse, it is God's gift to the world. So thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and ranking member. Thank you for giving me this time to speak on behalf of these horses. I hope that we can pass this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 126.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMP ACT OF 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1206) to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1206

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 "Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(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 Act, 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 4(b).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMPS.

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

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

SEC. 4. STATE APPLICATION.

(a) **APPROVAL OF APPLICATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary may not authorize a State to issue electronic stamps under this Act 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 Act, 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. 5. 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 Act shall receive an actual stamp—

(1) by not later than the date on which the electronic stamp expires under section 6(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 Act, 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 Act.

SEC. 6. ELECTRONIC STAMP REQUIREMENTS; RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC STAMP.

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

(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 Act 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. 7. TERMINATION OF STATE PARTICIPATION.

The authority of a State to issue electronic stamps under this Act 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 4; 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.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which I sponsored, would make permanent the ability of a migratory waterfowl hunter to electronically purchase their annual Federal duck stamp.

For the past 6 years, eight States have participated in a pilot effort, and by all accounts this program has been a huge success. Many Americans have been able to enjoy the convenience of using their own personal computer to purchase a Federal duck stamp online and in some cases to obtain that required document the evening before a duck hunt. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you from experience and knowing that people want that opportunity, that that timeliness is a factor in people being able to enjoy waterfowl hunting.

In August 2011, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service submitted a report to Congress which stipulated that the E-Duck stamp program has proven to be a practical method that is readily accepted by the stamp-buying public. E-stamps now account for more than 20 percent of all duck stamp sales, which demonstrates widespread acceptance of this sales option.

As vice chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I can proudly say that this legislation is important to waterfowl hunters across the country. H.R. 1206 is supported by the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and Ducks Unlimited. I would also like to thank and acknowledge Representative RON KIND as an original cosponsor of this bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a dedicated conservationist, an avid outdoorsman, and a longtime supporter and friend to sportsmen.

There is no cost to the taxpayers, and 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.

Allowing the purchase of duck stamps online is an important technological advancement, and it is time to make this a permanent feature of Federal law. During the last Congress, an identical bill passed the House by a

vote of 373-1. I urge adoption of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1206 would allow the Secretary of the Interior to continue the sale of electronic duck stamps and also expands the program to include all of our 50 States.

The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp, commonly known and called the “duck stamp,” must be purchased and carried by all waterfowl hunters 16 years and older when hunting migratory waterfowl on both public and private land.

Ninety-eight cents of every dollar generated by the sales of these stamps go to purchase or lease wetland habitat for the National Wildlife Refuge system, which benefits waterfowl. In some rural areas, purchasing the duck stamp can be very difficult. Often, hunters have to wait a significant amount of time to receive their official duck stamp, so utilizing the system of electronic duck stamp producing would eliminate the wait by issuing an electronic stamp with a unique identifying number to serve as a proof of purchase. Hunters can hunt and use the electronic stamp for 45 days until the actual duck stamp arrives via the postal service.

This is a worthwhile piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the minority has any more speakers.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. No, sir, not on this bill.

Mr. WITTMAN. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I yield back the balance of my time, sir.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my strong support for the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2013, H.R. 1206. I want to thank my coauthor and friend, ROB WITTMAN, for his dedication to getting this important legislation passed. In the 109th Congress, I authored legislation that created a pilot program for selling duck stamps electronically. The legislation passed with wide bipartisan support and the Electronic Duck Stamp program went on to become one of the most successful conservation programs in our history.

Since the beginning of duck stamp sales in 1934, the stamps have generated more than \$750 million used to purchase more than 5.3 million acres of waterfowl habitat. In Wisconsin alone, 6.78 million duck stamps have been sold thereby conserving numerous acres for waterfowl, birds, reptiles, mammals, fish, and amphibians. In addition to the benefits of conservation for wildlife, the habitats preserved give hunters and nature enthusiasts places to enjoy hiking, hunting, and animals watching. Additionally, these wetlands naturally purify

water supplies, keep flood lands, and help decrease soil erosion.

The Electronic Duck Stamp is terribly important to the district I represent in Wisconsin, which is home to three wildlife refuges. Almost the entire west side of my district is a refuge—the Upper Mississippi River Wildlife & Fish Refuge which is visited by 4 million people every year, more than Yellowstone. I want to urge my colleagues to support this common-sense yet vital legislation. I look forward to working toward getting this bill through the Senate and signed into law this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1206.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1710

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY EXPANSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 885) to expand the boundary of San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, to conduct a study of potential land acquisitions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 885

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 “San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. BOUNDARY EXPANSION.

Section 201(a) of Public Law 95-629 (16 U.S.C. 410ee(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “In order” and inserting “(1) In order”;

(2) by striking “The park shall also” and inserting the following:

“(2) The park shall also”;

(3) by striking “After advising the” and inserting the following:

“(5) After advising the”.

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) (as so designated by paragraph (2)) the following:

“(3) The boundary of the park is further modified to include approximately 137 acres, as depicted on the map titled ‘San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Proposed Boundary Addition’, numbered 472/113,006A, and dated June 2012. The map shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

“(4) The Secretary may not acquire by condemnation any land or interest in land within the boundaries of the park. The Secretary is authorized to acquire land and interests in land that are within the boundaries of the park pursuant to paragraph (3) by donation or exchange

only (and in the case of an exchange, no payment may be made by the Secretary to any landowner). No private property or non-Federal public property shall be included within the boundaries of the park without the written consent of the owner of such property. Nothing in this Act, the establishment of the park, or the management plan of the park shall be construed to create buffer zones outside of the park. That an activity or use can be seen or heard from within the park shall not preclude the conduct of that activity or use outside the park.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 885 will expand the San Antonio Missions National Historic Park to include an additional 137 acres. Each of these 137 acres is currently owned and being managed by the National Park Service, so additional operating costs will be minimal, if there are any at all.

The Natural Resources Committee amended H.R. 885 to further control costs by requiring that any property acquired through this legislation be only by donation or exchange, and condemnation is explicitly prohibited. Additional property rights provisions require written consent of property owners before their land can be included in the boundaries of the park, and the creation of buffer zones around the park is forbidden.

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

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 885, the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park Boundary Expansion Act 2013. Being a born-and-raised Texan, this is a very dear to my heart issue.

I do want to thank Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT and the entire bipartisan San Antonio delegation for pushing this very important piece of legislation forward. This is the third time the House has considered legislation to expand the San Antonio Missions. Hopefully, the third time will be the charm.

Currently, there are 137 acres of land managed by the National Park Service that are not part of the existing San Antonio Missions National Historical Park. Expanding the boundaries of the park will ensure that these cultural and archaeological resources are protected.