

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 be 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 co-operation.

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”;

(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”;

(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”;

(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 CO-OPERATION.

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. 4601-6d) 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. 4601-6d) 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 license 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 benefited, 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. GALLEGOS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113-339.

Mr. GALLEGOS. 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. GALLEGOS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGOS. 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 than 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. GALLEGOS. 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. GALLEG0. 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. GALLEG0. 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. GALLEG0).

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 amend-

ment. 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 (1), nothing".

Page 45, after line 24, insert the following:

(1) **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 non-motorized 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 hunt-

ing 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