

It also reflects a dramatic change of heart from Senator GRASSLEY, who once said a nominee should be considered, regardless of election politics. This is hypocrisy, plain and simple.

I accept that Senate Republicans have the constitutional authority to reject the President's nominee, but I do not accept their refusal to even consider that nominee. The American people shouldn't accept it either.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF THE POTTER COUNTY EXTENSION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Penn State Potter County Cooperative Extension, which connects those in the agriculture industry with the tools and the knowledge to build and grow their farms. This landmark anniversary will be celebrated at the Extension's annual Black and White Gala this Saturday, February 27.

Agriculture continues to be a major industry in Potter County and has also played a big role in the county's heritage, especially when it comes to potatoes.

Potter County is the home of Potato City, which was built in 1949 through the efforts of the Pennsylvania potato growers, packers, and related industries.

It was there that Dr. E.L. Nixon, uncle of President Richard Nixon, worked on the development of new types of potatoes for crossbreeding. To this day, the Potato City Country Inn is a tourist destination for people across the Commonwealth.

Potatoes from Potter County also continue to be sold across the United States and in many foreign countries.

I congratulate the Extension on 100 years of serving local farmers, and I wish them continued success in the future.

□ 0915

#### NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of National Eating Disorders Awareness Week.

Millions of Americans across the country are suffering from eating disorders. It affects their health, their happiness, and can take their lives. I understand what they are going through because I personally struggled with an eating disorder as a teenager and a young woman.

I am speaking up today in the hopes of raising awareness and providing hope. I want other young men and women who are struggling as I did to

know that they, too, can overcome this. I want to tell them that I know it is difficult, but don't wait to seek out help.

Mr. Speaker, by raising awareness, promoting treatment, and with early intervention, we can save lives.

#### SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2406.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 619 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2406.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 0916

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2406) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, February 25, 2016, all time for general debate had expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute, recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2406

*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 2015" or the "SHARE Act".*

##### SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

*The table of contents for this Act is as follows:*

*Sec. 1. Short title.*

*Sec. 2. Table of contents.*

*Sec. 3. Report on economic impact.*

##### TITLE I—HUNTING, FISHING AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING PROTECTION ACT

*Sec. 101. Short title.*

*Sec. 102. Modification of definition.*

*Sec. 103. Limitation on authority to regulate ammunition and fishing tackle.*

##### TITLE II—TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT

*Sec. 201. Short title.*

*Sec. 202. Findings; purpose.*

*Sec. 203. Definition of public target range.*

*Sec. 204. Amendments to Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act.*

*Sec. 205. Limits on liability.*

*Sec. 206. Sense of Congress regarding cooperation.*

##### TITLE III—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS ACT

*Sec. 301. Short title.*

*Sec. 302. Permits for importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada.*

##### TITLE IV—RECREATIONAL LANDS SELF-DEFENSE ACT

*Sec. 401. Short title.*

*Sec. 402. Protecting Americans from violent crime.*

##### TITLE V—WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Sec. 501. Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee.*

##### TITLE VI—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE OPPORTUNITIES ACT

*Sec. 601. Short title.*

*Sec. 602. Findings.*

*Sec. 603. Fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting.*

*Sec. 604. Volunteer Hunters; Reports; Closures and Restrictions.*

##### TITLE VII—FARMER AND HUNTER PROTECTION ACT

*Sec. 701. Short title.*

*Sec. 702. Baiting of migratory game birds.*

##### TITLE VIII—TRANSPORTING BOWS ACROSS NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDS

*Sec. 801. Short title.*

*Sec. 802. Bowhunting opportunity and wildlife stewardship.*

##### TITLE IX—FEDERAL LAND TRANSACTION FACILITATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION (FLTFA)

*Sec. 901. Short title.*

*Sec. 902. Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act.*

##### TITLE X—AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION AND LEGAL IVORY POSSESSION ACT

*Sec. 1001. Short title.*

*Sec. 1002. References.*

*Sec. 1003. Limited exemption for certain African elephant ivory.*

*Sec. 1004. Placement of United States Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement officer in each African elephant range country.*

*Sec. 1005. Certification for the purposes of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967.*

*Sec. 1006. Treatment of elephant ivory.*

*Sec. 1007. Sport-hunted elephant trophies.*

*Sec. 1008. African Elephant Conservation Act financial assistance priority and reauthorization.*

##### TITLE XI—RESPECT FOR TREATIES AND RIGHTS

*Sec. 1101. Respect for Treaties and Rights.*

##### TITLE XII—INTEREST ON OBLIGATIONS HELD IN THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND

*Sec. 1201. Interest on obligations held in the wildlife restoration fund.*

##### TITLE XIII—PERMITS FOR FILM CREWS OF FIVE PEOPLE OR LESS

*Sec. 1301. Annual permit and fee for film crews of 5 persons or fewer.*

**TITLE XIV—STATE APPROVAL OF FISHING RESTRICTION**

Sec. 1401. State or Territorial Approval of Restriction of Recreational or Commercial Fishing Access to Certain State or Territorial Waters.

**TITLE XV—HUNTING AND RECREATIONAL FISHING WITHIN CERTAIN NATIONAL FORESTS**

Sec. 1501. Definitions.  
Sec. 1502. Hunting and recreational fishing within the national forest system.

**TITLE XVI—GRAND CANYON BISON MANAGEMENT ACT**

Sec. 1601. Short title.  
Sec. 1602. Definitions.  
Sec. 1603. Bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park.

**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).

**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.”;

**SEC. 103. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO REGULATE AMMUNITION AND FISHING TACKLE.**

(a) **LIMITATION.**—Except as provided in section 20.21 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, or any substantially similar successor regulation thereto, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and, except as provided by subsection (b), any bureau, service, or office of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, may not regulate the use of ammunition cartridges, ammunition components, or fishing tackle based on the lead content thereof if such use is in compliance with the law of the State in which the use occurs.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Park Service.

**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 COOPERATION.**

It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management should cooperate with State and local authorities and other entities to carry out waste removal and other activities on any Federal land used as a public target range to encourage continued use of that land for target practice or marksmanship training.

**TITLE III—POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION AND FAIRNESS ACT**

**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 302. 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 2015.”

**TITLE IV—RECREATIONAL LANDS SELF-DEFENSE ACT**

**SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Recreational Lands Self-Defense Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 402. PROTECTING AMERICANS FROM VIOLENCE.**

(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 V—WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**SEC. 501. 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) CONTINUANCE AND ABOLISHMENT OF EXISTING WILDLIFE AND HUNTING HERITAGE CONSERVATION COUNCIL.—The Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council established pursuant to section 441 of the Revised Statutes (43 U.S.C. 1457), section 2 of 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—

“(1) shall continue until the date of the first meeting of the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council established by the amendment made by subsection (a); and

“(2) is hereby abolished effective on that date.

“(c) 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.

“(d) 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) Tribal resource management organizations.

“(x) The agriculture industry.

“(xi) The ranching industry.

“(xii) Women’s hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organization.

“(xiii) Minority hunting and fishing advocacy, outreach, or education organization.

“(xiv) Veterans service organization.

“(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 may 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.

“(e) **EXPENSES.**—The expenses of the Advisory Committee that the Secretaries determine to be reasonable and appropriate shall be paid by the Secretaries.

“(f) **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.

“(g) **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.

“(h) **FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.**—The Advisory Committee shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).”

**TITLE VI—RECREATIONAL FISHING AND HUNTING HERITAGE OPPORTUNITIES ACT**  
**SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Recreational Fishing and Hunting Heritage and Opportunities Act”.

**SEC. 602. 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 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 recreational 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;

(7) safe recreational shooting is a valid use of Federal lands, including the establishment of safe and convenient recreational shooting ranges on such lands, and participation in recreational shooting helps recruit and retain hunters and contributes to wildlife conservation;

(8) 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

(9) 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 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. 603. FISHING, HUNTING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means any land or water that is owned by the United States and under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS.**—The term “Federal land management officials” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior and Director of the Bureau of Land Management regarding Bureau of Land Management lands and interests in lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) the Secretary of Agriculture and Chief of the Forest Service regarding National Forest System lands.

(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.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and subsection (e), and cooperation with the respective State fish and wildlife agency, Federal land management officials shall exercise authority under existing law, including provisions regarding land use planning, to facilitate use of and access to Federal 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, 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 fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting on specific Federal lands, waters, or units thereof; and

(3) discretionary limitations on fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting determined to be

necessary and reasonable as supported by the best scientific evidence and advanced through a transparent public process.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—Consistent with subsection (a), Federal land management officials shall exercise their land management discretion—

(1) in a manner that supports and facilitates fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting opportunities;

(2) to the extent authorized under applicable State law; and

(3) in accordance with applicable Federal law.

(d) **PLANNING.**—

(1) **EVALUATION OF EFFECTS ON OPPORTUNITIES TO ENGAGE IN FISHING, HUNTING, OR RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.**—Planning documents that apply to Federal lands, including land resources management plans, resource management plans, travel management plans, and general management plans shall include a specific evaluation of the effects of such plans on opportunities to engage in fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting.

(2) **STRATEGIC GROWTH POLICY FOR THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM.**—Section 4(a)(3) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(a)(3)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B), the following:

“(C) the Secretary shall integrate wildlife-dependent recreational uses in accordance with their status as priority general public uses into proposed or existing regulations, policies, criteria, plans, or other activities to alter or amend the manner in which individual refuges or the National Wildlife Refuge System (System) are managed, including, but not limited to, any activities which target or prioritize criteria for long and short term System acquisitions;”.

(3) **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 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.

(4) **OTHER ACTIVITY NOT CONSIDERED.**—Federal land management officials are not required to consider the existence or availability of fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting opportunities on adjacent or nearby public or private lands in the planning for or determination of which Federal lands are open for these activities or in the setting of levels of use for these activities on Federal lands, unless the combination or coordination of such opportunities would enhance the fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting opportunities available to the public.

(e) **FEDERAL 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 fishing, hunting, and recreational 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) RECREATIONAL SHOOTING RANGES.—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The head of each Federal agency shall use his or her authorities in a manner consistent with this Act and other applicable law, to—

(i) lease or permit use of lands under the jurisdiction of the agency for recreational 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.

## (f) NECESSITY IN WILDERNESS AREAS AND “WITHIN AND SUPPLEMENTAL TO” WILDERNESS PURPOSES.—

(1) *MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.*—The provision of opportunities for fishing, hunting, 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, each Federal land management official 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 maintenance within designated wilderness areas.

(g) *NO PRIORITY.*—Nothing in this section requires a Federal land management official to give preference to fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting over other uses of Federal land or over land or water management priorities established by Federal law.

(h) *CONSULTATION WITH COUNCILS.*—In fulfilling the duties under this section, Federal land management officials shall consult with respective advisory councils as established in Executive Order Nos. 12962 and 13443.

(i) *AUTHORITY OF THE STATES.*—Nothing in this section 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 land.

(j) *FEDERAL LICENSES.*—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize a Federal land management official to require a license, fee, or permit to fish, hunt, or trap on land or water in a State, including on Federal land in the States, except that this subsection 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.).

**SEC. 604. VOLUNTEER HUNTERS; REPORTS; CLOSURES AND RESTRICTIONS.**

(a) *DEFINITIONS.*—For the purposes of this section:

(1) *PUBLIC LAND.*—The term “public land” means—

(A) units of the National Park System;

(B) National Forest System lands; and

(C) land and interests in land owned by the United States and under the administrative jurisdiction of—

(i) the Fish and Wildlife Service; or

(ii) the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) *SECRETARY.*—The term “Secretary” means—

(A) the Secretary of the Interior and includes the Director of the National Park Service, with regard to units of the National Park System;

(B) the Secretary of the Interior and includes the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, with regard to Fish and Wildlife Service lands and waters;

(C) the Secretary of the Interior and includes the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, with regard to Bureau of Land Management lands and waters; and

(D) the Secretary of Agriculture and includes the Chief of the Forest Service, with regard to National Forest System lands.

(3) *VOLUNTEER FROM THE HUNTING COMMUNITY.*—The term “volunteer from the hunting community” means a volunteer who holds a valid hunting license issued by a State.

(b) *VOLUNTEER HUNTERS.*—When planning wildlife management involving reducing the size of a wildlife population on public land, the Secretary shall consider the use of and may use volunteers from the hunting community as agents to assist in carrying out wildlife management on public land. The Secretary shall not reject the use of volunteers from the hunting community as agents without the concurrence of the appropriate State wildlife management authorities.

(c) *REPORT.*—Beginning on the second October 1 after the date of the enactment of this Act and biennially on October 1 thereafter, the Secretary 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 public land administered by the Secretary that was closed to fishing, hunting, and recreational shooting at any time during the preceding year; and

(2) the reason for the closure.

(d) *CLOSURES OR SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Other than closures established or prescribed by land planning actions referred to in section 604(e) or emergency closures described in paragraph (2), a permanent or temporary withdrawal, change of classification, or change of management status of public land that effectively closes or significantly restricts any acreage of public land to access or use for fishing, hunting, recreational shooting, or activities related to fishing, hunting, or recreational shooting, or a combination of those activities, shall take effect only if, before the date of withdrawal or change, the Secretary—

(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) *EMERGENCY CLOSURES.*—Nothing in this Act prohibits the Secretary 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 Act.

**TITLE VII—FARMER AND HUNTER PROTECTION ACT****SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Hunter and Farmer Protection Act”.

**SEC. 702. BAITING OF MIGRATORY GAME BIRDS.**

Section 3 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 704) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) *PROHIBITION OF BAITING.*—

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

“(A) *BAITED AREA.*—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘baited area’ means—

“(I) any area on which salt, grain, or other feed has been placed, exposed, deposited, distributed, or scattered, if the salt, grain, or feed could lure or attract migratory game birds; and

“(II) in the case of waterfowl, cranes (family Gruidae), and coots (family Rallidae), a standing, unharvested crop that has been manipulated through activities such as mowing, discing, or rolling, unless the activities are normal agricultural practices.

“(ii) *EXCLUSIONS.*—An area shall not be considered to be a ‘baited area’ if the area—

“(I) has been treated with a normal agricultural practice;

“(II) has standing crops that have not been manipulated; or

“(III) has standing crops that have been or are flooded.

“(B) *BAITING.*—The term ‘baiting’ means the direct or indirect placing, exposing, depositing, distributing, or scattering of salt, grain, or other feed that could lure or attract migratory game birds to, on, or over any areas on which a hunter is attempting to take migratory game birds.

“(C) *MIGRATORY GAME BIRD.*—The term ‘migratory game bird’ means migratory bird species—

“(i) that are within the taxonomic families of Anatidae, Columbidae, Gruidae, Rallidae, and Scolopacidae; and

“(ii) for which open seasons are prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

“(D) *NORMAL AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE.*—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—The term ‘normal agricultural practice’ means any practice in 1 annual growing season that—

“(I) is carried out in order to produce a marketable crop, including planting, harvest, postharvest, or soil conservation practices; and

“(II) is recommended for the successful harvest of a given crop by the applicable State office of the Cooperative Extension System of the Department of Agriculture, in consultation with, and if requested, the concurrence of, the head of the applicable State department of fish and wildlife.

“(ii) *INCLUSIONS.*—

“(I) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subclause (II), the term ‘normal agricultural practice’ includes the destruction of a crop in accordance with practices required by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for agricultural producers to obtain crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) on land on which a crop during the current or immediately preceding crop year was not harvestable due to a natural disaster (including any hurricane, storm, tornado, flood, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, drought, fire, snowstorm, or other catastrophe that is declared a major disaster by the President in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170)).

“(II) *LIMITATIONS.*—The term ‘normal agricultural practice’ only includes a crop described in subclause (I) that has been destroyed or manipulated through activities that include (but are not limited to) mowing, discing, or rolling if the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation certifies that flooding was not an acceptable method of destruction to obtain crop insurance under the

Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.).

“(E) WATERFOWL.—The term ‘waterfowl’ means native species of the family Anatidae.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person—

“(A) to take any migratory game bird by baiting or on or over any baited area, if the person knows or reasonably should know that the area is a baited area; or

“(B) to place or direct the placement of bait on or adjacent to an area for the purpose of causing, inducing, or allowing any person to take or attempt to take any migratory game bird by baiting or on or over the baited area.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior may promulgate regulations to implement this subsection.

“(4) REPORTS.—Annually, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior a report that describes any changes to normal agricultural practices across the range of crops grown by agricultural producers in each region of the United States in which the recommendations are provided to agricultural producers.”.

**TITLE VIII—TRANSPORTING BOWS ACROSS NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDS**

**SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Hunter Access Corridors Act”.

**SEC. 802. BOWHUNTING OPPORTUNITY AND WILDLIFE STEWARDSHIP.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 1015 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 101513. Hunter access corridors**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) NOT READY FOR IMMEDIATE USE.—The term ‘not ready for immediate use’ means—

“(A) a bow or crossbow, the arrows of which are secured or stowed in a quiver or other arrow transport case; and

“(B) with respect to a crossbow, uncocked.

“(2) VALID HUNTING LICENSE.—The term ‘valid hunting license’ means a State-issued hunting license that authorizes an individual to hunt on private or public land adjacent to the System unit in which the individual is located while in possession of a bow or crossbow that is not ready for immediate use.

“(b) TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall not require a permit for, or promulgate or enforce any regulation that prohibits an individual from transporting bows and crossbows that are not ready for immediate use across any System unit if—

“(A) in the case of an individual traversing the System unit on foot—

“(i) the individual is not otherwise prohibited by law from possessing the bows and crossbows;

“(ii) the bows or crossbows are not ready for immediate use throughout the period during which the bows or crossbows are transported across the System unit;

“(iii) the possession of the bows and crossbows is in compliance with the law of the State in which the System unit is located; and

“(iv) (I) the individual possesses a valid hunting license;

“(II) the individual is traversing the System unit en route to a hunting access corridor established under subsection (c)(1); or

“(III) the individual is traversing the System unit in compliance with any other applicable regulations or policies; or

“(B) the bows or crossbows are not ready for immediate use and remain inside a vehicle.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this subsection limits the authority of the Director to enforce laws (including regulations) prohibiting hunting or the taking of wildlife in any System unit.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF HUNTER ACCESS CORRIDORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On a determination by the Director under paragraph (2), the Director may establish and publish (in accordance with section 1.5 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)), on a publicly available map, hunter access corridors across System units that are used to access public land that is—

“(A) contiguous to a System unit; and

“(B) open to hunting.

“(2) DETERMINATION BY DIRECTOR.—The determination referred to in paragraph (1) is a determination that the hunter access corridor would provide wildlife management or visitor experience benefits within the boundary of the System unit in which the hunter access corridor is located.

“(3) HUNTING SEASON.—The hunter access corridors shall be open for use during hunting seasons.

“(4) EXCEPTION.—The Director may establish limited periods during which access through the hunter access corridors is closed for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable law.

“(5) IDENTIFICATION OF CORRIDORS.—The Director shall—

“(A) make information regarding hunter access corridors available on the individual website of the applicable System unit; and

“(B) provide information regarding any processes established by the Director for transporting legally taken game through individual hunter access corridors.

“(6) REGISTRATION; TRANSPORTATION OF GAME.—The Director may—

“(A) provide registration boxes to be located at the trailhead of each hunter access corridor for self-registration;

“(B) provide a process for online self-registration; and

“(C) allow nonmotorized conveyances to transport legally taken game through a hunter access corridor established under this subsection, including game carts and sleds.

“(7) CONSULTATION WITH STATES.—The Director shall consult with each applicable State wildlife agency to identify appropriate hunter access corridors.

“(d) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

“(1) diminishes, enlarges, or modifies any Federal or State authority with respect to recreational hunting, recreational shooting, or any other recreational activities within the boundaries of a System unit; or

“(2) authorizes—

“(A) the establishment of new trails in System units; or

“(B) authorizes individuals to access areas in System units, on foot or otherwise, that are not open to such access.

“(e) NO MAJOR FEDERAL ACTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any action taken under this section shall not be considered a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

“(2) NO ADDITIONAL ACTION REQUIRED.—No additional identification, analyses, or consideration of environmental effects (including cumulative environmental effects) is necessary or required with respect to an action taken under this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 101512 the following:

“101513. Hunter access corridors.”.

**TITLE IX—FEDERAL LAND TRANSACTION FACILITATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION (FLTFA)**

**SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act Reauthorization of 2015”.

**SEC. 902. FEDERAL LAND TRANSACTION FACILITATION ACT.**

The Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act is amended—

(1) in section 203(1) (43 U.S.C. 2302(1)), by striking “cultural, or” and inserting “cultural, recreational access and use, or other”;

(2) in section 203(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “on the date of enactment of this Act was” and inserting “is”;

(3) in section 205 (43 U.S.C. 2304)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “section 206” and all that follows through the period and inserting the following: “section 206—

“(1) to complete appraisals and satisfy other legal requirements for the sale or exchange of public land identified for disposal under approved land use plans under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712);

“(2) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act Reauthorization of 2015, to establish and make available to the public, on the website of the Department of the Interior, a database containing a comprehensive list of all the land referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(3) to maintain the database referred to in paragraph (2).”;

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “11” and inserting “22”;

(4) by amending section 206(c)(1) (43 U.S.C. 2305(c)(1)) to read as follows:

“(1) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Funds in the Federal Land Disposal Account shall be expended in accordance with this subsection.

“(B) PURPOSES.—Except as authorized under paragraph (2), funds in the Federal Land Disposal Account shall be used for one or more of the following purposes:

“(i) To purchase lands or interests therein that are otherwise authorized by law to be acquired and are one or more of the following:

“(I) Inholdings.

“(II) Adjacent to federally designated areas and contain exceptional resources.

“(III) Provide opportunities for hunting, recreational fishing, recreational shooting, and other recreational activities.

“(IV) Likely to aid in the performance of deferred maintenance or the reduction of operation and maintenance costs or other deferred costs.

“(ii) To perform deferred maintenance or other maintenance activities that enhance opportunities for recreational access.”;

(5) in section 206(c)(2) (43 U.S.C. 2305(c)(2))—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A);

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively;

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated by this paragraph)—

(i) by striking “PURCHASES” and inserting “LAND PURCHASES AND PERFORMANCE OF DEFERRED MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES”;

(ii) by striking “subparagraph (C)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(iii) by inserting “for the activities outlined in paragraph (2)” after “generated”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) Any funds made available under subparagraph (C) that are not obligated or expended by the end of the fourth full fiscal year after the date of the sale or exchange of land that generated the funds may be expended in any State.”;

(6) in section 206(c)(3) (43 U.S.C. 2305(c)(3))—

(A) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the extent to which the acquisition of the land or interest therein will increase the public availability of resources for, and facilitate public access to, hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D);



(7) in section 206(f) (43 U.S.C. 2305(f)), by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) any remaining balance in the account shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction, except that in the case of a fiscal year for which there is no Federal budget deficit, such amounts shall be used to reduce the Federal debt (in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).”; and

(8) in section 207(b) (43 U.S.C. 2306(b))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “96–568” and inserting “96–586”; and

(ii) by striking “; or” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting “Public Law 105–263;” before “112 Stat.”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the White Pine County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–432; 120 Stat. 3028);

“(4) the Lincoln County Conservation, Recreation, and Development Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–424; 118 Stat. 2403);

“(5) subtitle F of title I of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 111–11);

“(6) subtitle O of title I of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 460uuuu note, 1132 note; Public Law 111–11);

“(7) section 2601 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1108); or

“(8) section 2606 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1121).”.

#### **TITLE X—AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION AND LEGAL IVORY POSSESSION ACT**

##### **SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “African Elephant Conservation and Legal Ivory Possession Act of 2015”.

##### **SEC. 1002. REFERENCES.**

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.).

##### **SEC. 1003. LIMITED EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN AFRICAN ELEPHANT IVORY.**

Section 2203 (16 U.S.C. 4223) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before the first sentence;

(2) by inserting “and subsection (b) of this section” after “2202(e).”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EXEMPTION.—Nothing in this Act or subsection (a) or (d) of section 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538) shall be construed to prohibit importation or exportation, or to require permission of the Secretary for importation or exportation, of—

“(1) any raw ivory or worked ivory—

“(A) imported solely for purposes of becoming part of a museum’s permanent collection, return to a lending museum, or display in a museum; or

“(B) exported solely for purposes of—

“(i) display in a foreign museum; or

“(ii) return to a foreign person who lent such ivory to a museum in the United States;

“(2) any raw ivory or worked ivory that was lawfully importable into the United States on February 24, 2014, regardless of when acquired; or

“(3) any worked ivory that was previously lawfully possessed in the United States.”.

##### **SEC. 1004. PLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IN EACH AFRICAN ELEPHANT RANGE COUNTRY.**

Part I (16 U.S.C. 4211 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“SEC. 2105. PLACEMENT OF UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IN EACH AFRICAN ELEPHANT RANGE COUNTRY.**

“The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of State, may station one United States Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement officer in the primary United States diplomatic or consular post in each African country that has a significant population of African elephants, who shall assist local wildlife rangers in the protection of African elephants and facilitate the apprehension of individuals who illegally kill, or assist the illegal killing of, African elephants.”.

##### **SEC. 1005. CERTIFICATION FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE FISHERMEN’S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.**

Section 2202 (16 U.S.C. 4222) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) CERTIFICATION.—When the Secretary of the Interior finds that a country, directly or indirectly, is a significant transit or destination point for illegal ivory trade, the Secretary shall certify such fact to the President with respect to the country for the purposes of section 8(a) of the Fishermen’s Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978(a)).”.

##### **SEC. 1006. TREATMENT OF ELEPHANT IVORY.**

Section 2203 (16 U.S.C. 4223) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) TREATMENT OF ELEPHANT IVORY.—Nothing in this Act or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538) shall be construed—

“(1) to prohibit, or to authorize prohibiting, the possession, sale, delivery, receipt, shipment, or transportation of African elephant ivory, or any product containing African elephant ivory, that has been lawfully imported or crafted in the United States; or

“(2) to authorize using any means of determining for purposes of this Act or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 whether African elephant ivory has been lawfully imported, including any presumption or burden of proof applied in such determination, other than such means used by the Secretary as of February 24, 2014.”.

##### **SEC. 1007. SPORT-HUNTED ELEPHANT TROPHIES.**

Section 2203 (16 U.S.C. 4223) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SPORT-HUNTED ELEPHANT TROPHIES.—Nothing in this Act or subsection (a) or (d) of section 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538) shall be construed to prohibit any citizen or legal resident of the United States, or an agent of such an individual, from importing a sport-hunted African elephant trophy under section 2202(e) of this Act, if the country in which the elephant was taken had an elephant population on Appendix II of CITES at the time the trophy elephant was taken.

“(e) RELATIONSHIP TO THE CONVENTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying or repealing the Secretary’s duties to implement CITES and the appendices thereto, or as modifying or repealing section 8A or 9(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1537a and 1538(c)).”.

##### **SEC. 1008. AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PRIORITY AND REAUTHORIZATION.**

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PRIORITY.—Section 2101 (16 U.S.C. 4211) is amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) PRIORITY.—In providing financial assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to projects designed to facilitate the acquisition of equipment and training of wildlife officials in ivory producing countries to be used in anti-poaching efforts.”.

(b) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 2306(a) (16 U.S.C. 4245(a)) is amended by striking “2007 through 2012” and inserting “2016 through 2020”.

#### **TITLE XI—RESPECT FOR TREATIES AND RIGHTS**

##### **SEC. 1101. 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.

#### **TITLE XII—INTEREST ON OBLIGATIONS HELD IN THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND**

##### **SEC. 1201. INTEREST ON OBLIGATIONS HELD IN THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.**

Section 3(b)(2)(C) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting “2026”.

#### **TITLE XIII—PERMITS FOR FILM CREWS OF FIVE PEOPLE OR LESS**

##### **SEC. 1301. ANNUAL PERMIT AND FEE FOR FILM CREWS OF 5 PERSONS OR FEWER.**

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section 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 land and waterways.

(b) NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAND.—Section 100905 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

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

“(A) DEFINITION OF FILM CREW.—In this paragraph, the term ‘film crew’ means any persons present on Federal land or waterways under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who are associated with the production of a film.

“(B) REQUIRED PERMIT AND FEE.—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 land and waterways administered by the Secretary.

“(C) COMMERCIAL FILMING ACTIVITIES.—A permit issued under subparagraph (B) shall be valid for commercial filming activities or similar projects that occur in areas designated for public use during public hours on all Federal land and waterways administered by the Secretary for a 1-year period beginning on the date of issuance of the permit.

“(D) NO ADDITIONAL FEES.—For persons holding a permit issued under this paragraph, during the effective period of the permit, the Secretary shall not assess any fees in addition to the fee assessed under subparagraph (B).

“(E) USE OF CAMERAS.—The Secretary shall not prohibit, as a mechanized apparatus 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 land and waterways administered by the Secretary.

“(F) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—A film crew of 5 persons or fewer subject to a permit issued under this paragraph shall notify the applicable land management agency with jurisdiction over the Federal land at least 48 hours before entering the Federal land.

“(G) DENIAL OF ACCESS.—The head of the applicable land management agency may deny access to a film crew under this paragraph if—

“(i) there is a likelihood of resource damage that cannot be mitigated;

“(ii) there would be an unreasonable disruption of the use and enjoyment of the site by the public;

“(iii) the activity poses health or safety risks to the public; or

“(iv) the filming includes the use of models or props that are not part of the natural or cultural resources or administrative facilities of the Federal land.”; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b), by striking “collect any costs” and inserting “recover any costs”.

(c) OTHER FEDERAL LAND.—Section 1 of Public Law 106–206 (16 U.S.C. 4601–6d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “The Secretary” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

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

“(A) DEFINITION OF FILM CREW.—In this paragraph, the term ‘film crew’ means any persons present on Federal land or waterways under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who are associated with the production of a film.

“(B) REQUIRED PERMIT AND FEE.—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 land and waterways administered by the Secretary.

“(C) COMMERCIAL FILMING ACTIVITIES.—A permit issued under subparagraph (B) shall be valid for commercial filming activities or similar projects that occur in areas designated for public use during public hours on all Federal land and waterways administered by the Secretary for a 1-year period beginning on the date of issuance of the permit.

“(D) NO ADDITIONAL FEES.—For persons holding a permit issued under this paragraph, during the effective period of the permit, the Secretary shall not assess any fees in addition to the fee assessed under subparagraph (B).

“(E) USE OF CAMERAS.—The Secretary shall not prohibit, as a mechanized apparatus 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 land and waterways administered by the Secretary.

“(F) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—A film crew of 5 persons or fewer subject to a permit issued under this paragraph shall notify the applicable land management agency with jurisdiction over the Federal land at least 48 hours before entering the Federal land.

“(G) DENIAL OF ACCESS.—The head of the applicable land management agency may deny access to a film crew under this paragraph if—

“(i) there is a likelihood of resource damage that cannot be mitigated;

“(ii) there would be an unreasonable disruption of the use and enjoyment of the site by the public;

“(iii) the activity poses health or safety risks to the public; or

“(iv) the filming includes the use of models or props that are not part of the natural or cultural resources or administrative facilities of the Federal land.”; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “collect any costs” and inserting “recover any costs”; and

(B) by striking “similar project” and inserting “similar projects”.

#### TITLE XIV—STATE APPROVAL OF FISHING RESTRICTION

##### SEC. 1401. STATE OR TERRITORIAL APPROVAL OF RESTRICTION OF RECREATIONAL OR COMMERCIAL FISHING ACCESS TO CERTAIN STATE OR TERRITORIAL WATERS.

(a) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall not restrict recreational or commercial fishing access to any State or territorial marine waters or Great Lakes waters within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service or the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, respectively, unless those restrictions are developed in coordination with, and approved by, the fish and wildlife management agency of the State or territory that has fisheries management authority over those waters.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “marine waters” includes coastal waters and estuaries.

#### TITLE XV—HUNTING AND RECREATIONAL FISHING WITHIN CERTAIN NATIONAL FORESTS

##### SEC. 1501. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) HUNTING.—The term “hunting” means use of a firearm, bow, or other authorized means in the lawful pursuit, shooting, capture, collection, trapping, or killing of wildlife; attempt to pursue, shoot, capture, collect, trap, or kill wildlife; or the training and use of hunting dogs, including field trials.

(2) RECREATIONAL FISHING.—The term “recreational fishing” means the lawful pursuit, capture, collection, or killing of fish; or attempt to capture, collect, or kill fish.

(3) FOREST PLAN.—The term “forest plan” means a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for a unit of the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(4) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.—The term “National Forest System” has the meaning given that term in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)).

##### SEC. 1502. HUNTING AND RECREATIONAL FISHING WITHIN THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM.

(a) PROHIBITION OF RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture or Chief of the Forest Service may not establish policies, directives, or regulations that restrict the type, season, or method of hunting or recreational fishing on lands within the National Forest System that are otherwise open to those activities and are consistent with the applicable forest plan.

(b) PRIOR RESTRICTIONS VOID.—Any restrictions imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture or Chief of the Forest Service regarding the type, season, or method of hunting or recreational fishing on lands within the National Forest System that are otherwise open to those activities in force on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be void and have no force or effect.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply only to the Kisatchie National Forest in the State of Louisiana, the De Soto National Forest in the State of Mississippi, and the Ozark National Forest, the St. Francis National Forest and the Ouachita National Forest in the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma.

(d) STATE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section, section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 551), or section 32 of the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1011) shall affect the authority of States to manage hunting or recreational fishing on lands within the National Forest System.

#### TITLE XVI—GRAND CANYON BISON MANAGEMENT ACT

##### SEC. 1601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Grand Canyon Bison Management Act”.

##### SEC. 1602. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the management plan published under section 1603(a).

(2) PARK.—The term “Park” means the Grand Canyon National Park.

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

(4) SKILLED PUBLIC VOLUNTEER.—The term “skilled public volunteer” means an individual who possesses—

(A) a valid hunting license issued by the State of Arizona; and

(B) such other qualifications as the Secretary may require, after consultation with the Arizona Game and Fish Commission.

##### SEC. 1603. BISON MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK.

(a) PUBLICATION OF PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish a management plan to

reduce, through humane lethal culling by skilled public volunteers and by other nonlethal means, the population of bison in the Park that the Secretary determines are detrimental to the use of the Park.

(b) REMOVAL OF ANIMAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a skilled public volunteer may remove a full bison harvested from the Park.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Arizona Game and Fish Commission regarding the development and implementation of the management plan.

(d) NEPA COMPLIANCE.—In developing the management plan, the Secretary shall comply with all applicable Federal environmental laws (including regulations), including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this title applies to the taking of wildlife in the Park for any purpose other than the implementation of the management plan.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–429. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WITTMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–429.

Mr. WITTMAN. 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 53, line 18, insert “, subject to appropriation,” after “expended”.

Page 63, strike lines 1 through 8.

Strike “of 2015” each place it appears.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### TITLE XVII—OPEN BOOK ON EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE

##### SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act”.

##### SEC. 1702. MODIFICATION OF EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE PROVISIONS.

(a) AGENCY PROCEEDINGS.—Section 504 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “, United States Code”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (i); and

(3) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e)(1) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, after consultation with the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, shall report to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year through the 6th calendar year beginning after the initial report under this subsection is submitted, on the amount of fees and other expenses awarded during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to this section. The report shall describe the number, nature, and amount of the awards, the claims involved in the controversy, and any other relevant information that may aid the Congress in evaluating the scope and impact of such awards. The report shall be made available to the public online.



“(2)(A) The report required by paragraph (1) shall account for all payments of fees and other expenses awarded under this section that are made pursuant to a settlement agreement, regardless of whether the settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions.

“(B) The disclosure of fees and other expenses required under subparagraph (A) does not affect any other information that is subject to nondisclosure provisions in the settlement agreement.

“(f) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall create and maintain, during the period beginning on the date the initial report under subsection (e) is submitted and ending one year after the date on which the final report under that subsection is submitted, online a searchable database containing the following information with respect to each award of fees and other expenses under this section:

“(1) The case name and number of the adversary adjudication, if available.

“(2) The name of the agency involved in the adversary adjudication.

“(3) A description of the claims in the adversary adjudication.

“(4) The name of each party to whom the award was made, as such party is identified in the order or other agency document making the award.

“(5) The amount of the award.

“(6) The basis for the finding that the position of the agency concerned was not substantially justified.

“(g) The online searchable database described in subsection (f) may not reveal any information the disclosure of which is prohibited by law or court order.

“(h) The head of each agency shall provide to the Chairman of the Administrative Conference in a timely manner all information requested by the Chairman to comply with the requirements of subsections (e), (f), and (g).”

(b) COURT CASES.—Section 2412(d) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5)(A) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States shall submit to the Congress, not later than March 31 of each year through the 6th calendar year beginning after the initial report under this paragraph is submitted, a report on the amount of fees and other expenses awarded during the preceding fiscal year pursuant to this subsection. The report shall describe the number, nature, and amount of the awards, the claims involved in each controversy, and any other relevant information that may aid the Congress in evaluating the scope and impact of such awards. The report shall be made available to the public online.

“(B)(i) The report required by subparagraph (A) shall account for all payments of fees and other expenses awarded under this subsection that are made pursuant to a settlement agreement, regardless of whether the settlement agreement is sealed or otherwise subject to nondisclosure provisions.

“(ii) The disclosure of fees and other expenses required under clause (i) does not affect any other information that is subject to nondisclosure provisions in the settlement agreement.

“(C) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall include and clearly identify in the annual report under subparagraph (A), for each case in which an award of fees and other expenses is included in the report—

“(i) any amounts paid from section 1304 of title 31 for a judgment in the case;

“(ii) the amount of the award of fees and other expenses; and

“(iii) the statute under which the plaintiff filed suit.

“(6) The Chairman of the Administrative Conference shall create and maintain, during

the period beginning on the date the initial report under paragraph (5) is submitted and ending one year after the date on which the final report under that paragraph is submitted, online a searchable database containing the following information with respect to each award of fees and other expenses under this subsection:

“(A) The case name and number.

“(B) The name of the agency involved in the case.

“(C) The name of each party to whom the award was made, as such party is identified in the order or other court document making the award.

“(D) A description of the claims in the case.

“(E) The amount of the award.

“(F) The basis for the finding that the position of the agency concerned was not substantially justified.

“(7) The online searchable database described in paragraph (6) may not reveal any information the disclosure of which is prohibited by law or court order.

“(8) The head of each agency (including the Attorney General of the United States) shall provide to the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States in a timely manner all information requested by the Chairman to comply with the requirements of paragraphs (5), (6), and (7).”

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “United States Code.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “of section 2412 of title 28, United States Code,” and inserting “of this section”; and

(B) by striking “of such title” and inserting “of this title”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall first apply with respect to awards of fees and other expenses that are made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) INITIAL REPORTS.—The first reports required by section 504(e) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(5) of title 28, United States Code, shall be submitted not later than March 31 of the calendar year following the first calendar year in which a fiscal year begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ONLINE DATABASES.—The online databases required by section 504(f) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(6) of title 28, United States Code, shall be established as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, but in no case later than the date on which the first reports under section 504(e) of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412(d)(5) of title 28, United States Code, are required to be submitted under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, this manager’s amendment makes technical changes to the underlying bill, makes expenditures under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act subject to appropriation, and eliminates the Pittman-Robertson interest on obligations language, title XII, which was signed into law last year.

The manager’s amendment also adds an important new title to the bill, the

Open Book on Equal Access to Justice Act, which makes that law more transparent. The Equal Access to Justice Act, or EAJA, was originally passed in 1980 as a social safety net program for seniors, veterans, and small businesses.

It was designed to pay back these little guys for the cost of suing the Federal Government in a once-in-a-lifetime event. However, special interest groups have used EAJA as a way to be reimbursed for lawsuits when they can’t be reimbursed under the Nation’s environmental laws. These illegitimate reimbursements not only cost taxpayers money, but they tie up our land management agencies, chasing procedural lawsuits instead of doing their actual job.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the manager’s amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I simply take a minute. Since we have no amendments on leaded bullets or lead in fishing, this may be the only time it is germane to clear up an issue from our debate yesterday evening.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), my good friend, mentioned about at shooting ranges, especially, bullets often end up back in the ground.

I just wanted to clarify, and let me quote from the Science and Environmental Health Network, that in the environment many chemicals are degraded by sunlight, destroyed through reactions with other environmental substances or metabolized by naturally occurring bacteria. Some chemicals, however, have features that enable them to resist environmental degradation. They are classified as persistent and can accumulate in soils and aquatic environments. Metals such as lead, mercury, and arsenic are always persistent since they are basic elements and cannot be further broken down and destroyed in the environment. Lead contamination of air, soil, or drinking water can ultimately result in significant exposures in fetuses, infants, and children, resulting in impaired brain development.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to get that on the record that the lead is not going to degrade once it hits the soil during hunting or fishing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. BEYER. 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 9, strike “and” after the semicolon at line 14, strike the period at line 16 and insert “; and”, and after line 16 insert the following:

(5) prohibits use of the location by any individual who is prohibited from purchasing a firearm by section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code.

Page 10, strike “and” after the semicolon at line 6, strike the closing quotation marks and period at line 8 and insert “and”, and after line 8 insert the following:

“(E) prohibits use of the location by any individual who is prohibited from purchasing a firearm by section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2406 would increase Federal assistance made available in the Pittman-Robertson Act for construction, operations, and maintenance of recreational shooting ranges on public lands.

I, myself, am an avid outdoorsman and a big proponent of recreational activities, and I understand the value of recreational shooting. However, I believe that with these privileges come certain responsibilities. One of those responsibilities is to ensure that we are not creating a situation where dangerous people are allowed to hone their shooting skills on the taxpayers' dime.

My amendment today simply says, if you operate a public shooting range and if you receive Federal assistance by way of this act, then you must have a policy, a notice of some sort in place stating that no person who is prohibited by Federal law from possessing a firearm is allowed to use the shooting range.

Nothing in this amendment creates new gun laws. Nothing in this amendment would infringe on the rights of responsible gun owners. Nothing in this amendment is onerous in any way. We are simply saying that the Federal Government should not be in the business of subsidizing dangerous people improving their marksmanship or creating spaces around guns where convicted felons feel like they can operate outside the law and endanger law-abiding sportsmen and -women. The Federal Government has an obligation to keep people safe.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amends the definition of public target ranges in title II and the definition of public target range as used for Pittman-Robertson funding.

This amendment is unnecessary, as it prohibits behavior which is already against the law. This amendment is also impractical. Administrators at public ranges would have no way of knowing who is prohibited and who is not. Public target ranges are not equipped to run background checks, and requiring them to do so would largely undermine the other purposes of the bill, like expanding access to ranges.

This amendment does not distinguish between public target ranges that allow only archery versus those that allow firearm use. The amendment would prohibit, without justification, certain persons from taking advantage of otherwise lawful and harmless recreational archery.

Access to the national background check screening data base is strictly limited by law and cannot be used to screen people just because they want to use a target range. The National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, and Safari Club International oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, with respect for my friend from Virginia, there is nothing in the amendment that suggests or requires background checks for people wanting to use public shooting ranges—in fact, just the opposite. All we are asking is that there be a policy or a notice saying, if you are otherwise prohibited from using weapons under Federal law, that you can't practice, hone your shooting skills on these ranges.

Mr. WITTMAN and I both come from Virginia, where we have six target ranges managed by the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. Those six public target ranges have 17 rules. These rules include: use paper targets only; organized competitive shooting is prohibited; use of unauthorized target materials, such as cans, bottles, clay birds is prohibited. None of these is onerous. All we are asking is for an 18th rule that says, if you are otherwise prohibited from using a gun under Federal law, then you can't use it at the target range.

We are not trying to extend background checks to everyone. That is not what this says. All we are trying to do is make sure that people who can't otherwise have possession of a gun don't go to a target range, rent one, and practice.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I remind the gentleman from Virginia—we all have an interest in shooting sports—that there is no evidence to suggest that there is an issue right now

with felons using this opportunity to perpetrate crimes at public shooting ranges, so I think it is a solution in search of a problem. We want to make sure that there is a balance there and that, indeed, people have access to these ranges.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, Federal law prohibits certain criminals from possessing firearms. This amendment assumes that a criminal who is forbidden from possessing a firearm, who then breaks that law and possesses one anyway, will then obey a law that says he can't bring the illegally possessed gun to a shooting range.

I have news for the author of this amendment. The last place a criminal wants to be is on a shooting range where he is surrounded by law-abiding and armed citizens. Criminals prefer gun-free zones where decent people can't fight back.

So what is the real purpose of this amendment? I think it is twofold. The first is to imply that gun ranges are brimming with criminals who are honing their skills to go on rampages. That is an insult to the many millions of Americans who own guns and who use shooting ranges.

Second, and more disturbing, it is to put the owners and managers of shooting ranges in an impossible legal position. How are they supposed to comply with this law? The gentleman says, well, they don't need to do background checks of every consumer, but what else are they then supposed to do in order to abide by this law? Require a 2-week waiting period to make reservations? How long before leftist legal firms begin suing these gun ranges for failing to do due diligence in thoroughly probing the backgrounds of their customers?

We have many laws on the books to prohibit the illegal use of firearms and to prohibit criminals from possessing them. That is the problem with criminals: they just don't obey our laws. But instead of putting them behind bars, where they can't hurt anyone, the left seeks to make it increasingly difficult for law-abiding citizens to defend themselves.

It shouldn't surprise us that the sum total of these laws is more gun violence and not less. I urge the House to defeat this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, all I need is just a few seconds to point out to my friend from California that many of the things that he objects to are irrelevant and not germane to this amendment.

We are not asking for background checks. We are certainly not setting up a structure where lawyers can sue. We are simply asking for a policy or notice

to be in place, as many other policies and notices are in place at gun shooting ranges around the country, that recognize that Federal law prohibits certain people, some dangerous people from possessing or using firearms in the United States, and especially the public shooting range that is being funded by the Federal Government under Pittman-Robertson.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to remind folks, too, that the law already prohibits certain individuals from possessing a firearm, from using it at a public range. The acquisition or possession of a firearm by a person subject to 18 U.S. Code 922, section (g), under any circumstances for any purpose is already a Federal felony. I think the law already covers that as far as who can and cannot own a firearm.

Having the additional effort of saying you can't access a public range is secondary to the primary violation of the law. I think that that is already covered if you are looking at making sure that guns aren't put in the hands of those folks who are convicted of these crimes.

Again, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I encourage my colleagues to do the same, to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

□ 0930

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-429.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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:

Beginning at page 14, line 3, strike title III.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order. Let me also thank Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. BEYER for their leadership on this issue.

Let me state for the record that I am from Texas, where there are many fish-

ermen, many hunters, and many sportsmen and -women, but we are also a people that understand unto whom much is given, much is expected. My amendment speaks to that very issue.

My amendment No. 3 strikes title III of the underlying bill that creates a loophole in the Marine Mammal Protection Act that would allow a handful of hunters to import polar bear trophies into the United States.

Let me provide for my colleagues a simple bit of information. Most people do not know, but polar bears are officially classified as marine mammals and, as such, are included under the 1972 Marine Mammal Protection Act. They are also listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, affording the iconic animals further protection against hunting, trapping, and capturing.

Over the last few years, these laws did not stop a handful of wealthy individuals from flying up to Canada to bag a trophy polar bear for their collection back home, even though they were warned that U.S. law would prohibit the importation of skins, heads, and other products from bears that they were hunting.

In 1994, well-funded hunting interests convinced Congress to amend the act, allowing a limited number of bears from trophy hunts, but only if the animal came from a designated population that could withstand the loss. Then in 2007, the Fish and Wildlife Service issued a proposed rule to list the polar bear as threatened. This continues.

In the Humane Society letter that supports my amendment, it is indicated that, in fact, we may lose two-thirds of the polar bear population by 2070.

My amendment is smart, it is right, it is humane. It responds to the conscience and the rightness of this country.

I am saddened to see these lovely animals—if I can call them that—become trophies to make someone else feel good. I ask my colleagues to recognize the importance of taking care of what God has given us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes a provision of the SHARE Act that will allow the importation of 41 polar bears legally harvested from sustainable populations in Canada before the polar bear was listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it always interests me when some people try to undo something that has already occurred legally.

Legally, these bears were taken under license of the Canadian Govern-

ment. Legally, they should have been allowed to be imported. And then, Secretary Kempthorne listed the polar bear as a threatened species. They are not endangered. In fact, we have a study now that the polar bear population has increased, not decreased.

The point is, these are 41 hides that were shot legally by individual hunters under the auspices of the Canadian law with proper guiding facilities, proper taxidermy facilities, and these bears are dead.

By the way, as these dead bears come to the United States, they create money to take and help conserve the rest of the live bears. If I was out buying something or it was given to me and it was declared illegal later on, I can't keep it? This is silliness.

This is a good part of this bill. It rectifies something that was done legally for hunters that did their hunting legally. Now we are saying that for human purposes, for the protection of the polar bear, we are not going to allow those 41 hides to come back into the United States that were shot legally?

We are not going to collect the money we used to save polar bears from these legally shot bears. This is not about the future. And by the way, Fish and Wildlife sort of likes this program.

I am always amazed that somebody is going to save a species that is not endangered—in fact, is not threatened—because they are going to save dead bears from coming into the United States that were shot legally.

I oppose this amendment. It is a mischievous amendment.

This amendment was backed by the Humane Society. Of course they are going to support her amendment, but the fact is they were shot legally. They should be allowed to be brought back in the country, as they were shot under the Government of Canada's auspices.

So let's reject this amendment. Let's stick to the facts, not emotions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia also has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Humane Society that I will include in the RECORD, along with an article regarding polar bear hunting.

THE HUMANE SOCIETY  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
February 24, 2016

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. JACKSON LEE: The Humane Society of the United States, Humane Society Legislative Fund, and Humane Society International strongly support your amendment to H.R. 2406, the so-called "Sportsmen's Heritage and Recreational Enhancement (SHARE) Act of 2015." This harmful legislation contains a variety of provisions that threaten wildlife, including one that would allow U.S. trophy hunters to import the heads and hides of threatened polar bears from Canada. Your amendment to strike this

language sends a strong message that our country should be protecting vulnerable species, not carving out exceptions for the small fraction of the hunting public that travels the globe to kill its most majestic creatures.

Title III of H.R. 2406 would weaken the Marine Mammal Protection Act by permitting the importation of trophies from 41 polar bears killed as the Fish and Wildlife Service finalized a rule listing them as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The wealthy trophy hunters that shot these bears had full knowledge of the pending rule, and knew that U.S. law would likely prohibit them from bringing back their kill. We should not give these hunters a free pass to exploit a regulatory loophole.

This is just the latest in a recent series of import allowances by Congress. It would send a message that politically-connected trophy hunters can kill endangered and threatened species around the globe, put the trophies in storage, and wait around for their congressional allies to get them permission to bring the heads and hides into the country for display over mantles in living rooms. The provision does not help rank-and-file hunters and sportsmen, who would never dream of traveling to the Arctic to shoot a polar bear, or to Africa to shoot a lion.

Scientists estimate that we may lose two-thirds of the polar bear population by 2050. Congress should do all it can / to protect such vanishing species from extinction instead of incentivizing trophy hunters to kill as many as possible in advance of pending ESA listings. This is a critical measure to ensure the long-term viability of imperiled animals around the globe.

When Cecil, the beloved African lion, was killed by an American dentist it shined a light on the shameful subculture of trophy hunters, who spend their fortunes traveling the globe to kill the rarest and most majestic species on earth. We applaud your amendment, which provides real protections for endangered and threatened species.

Sincerely,

WAYNE PACELE,  
President and CEO,  
The Humane Society  
of the United States.

MICHAEL MARKARIAN,  
President, Humane Society  
Legislative  
Fund.

[From TakePart.com, May 5, 2013]

POLAR BEAR TROPHY HUNTERS: KILL NOW,  
GET PERMISSION LATER

(By David Kirby)

Most people don't know it, but polar bears are officially classified as marine mammals, and as such are included under the 1972 Marine Mammal Protection Act. They are also listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, affording the iconic animals further protection against hunting, trapping and capturing.

But over the past few years, those laws did not stop a handful of wealthy individuals from flying up to Canada to bag a "trophy" polar bear for their collection back home, even though they were warned that U.S. law would prohibit the importation of skins, heads and other products from the bears they were hunting.

Those trophy hunters have in the past managed to secure an exemption from Congress, allowing some of the trophy bears to enter the United States.

Now the trophy hunters and their friends in D.C. are at it again. Last week, Rep. Don Young (R-AK) introduced a new bill in the house, "To amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow the importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada."

On the Senate side, Mike Crapo (R-ID) offered a similar though slightly more restrictive bill, the "Polar Bear Conservation and Fairness Act of 2013."

The Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 outlawed the sport hunting of all polar bears in the United States and banned the import of any marine mammal product into the country.

But in 1994, well-funded hunting interests convinced Congress to amend the act, allowing in a limited number of bears from trophy hunts, but only if the animal came from a designated population that could withstand the loss.

Then, in January 2007, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a proposed rule to list the polar bear as "threatened" on the endangered species list, which meant no bears from any populations could be imported.

FWS had until January 2008 to issue its final ruling. But the deadline came and went and there was still no listing of the bears. A federal court intervened, ordering the agency to publish the rule by May 15, 2008, adding that the new rule would take effect immediately.

By law, then, no polar bear killed from any population could be imported after May 15, 2008, into the U.S., regardless of when the permit had been issued.

Trophy hunters were given repeated warnings from hunting organizations and government agencies that trophy bears killed in 2008 would not be allowed into the United States: They were hunting at their own risk.

Even pro-trophy-hunting groups such as Conservation Force issued repeated and dire warnings to its members, including one in a December 2007 newsletter that stated, "American hunters are asking us whether they should even look at polar bear hunts in light of the current effort by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to list this species as threatened; [t]he bottom line is, no American hunter should be putting hard, non-returnable money down on a polar bear hunt at this point."

And, the newsletter continued, "We feel compelled to tell you that American trophy hunters are likely to be barred from importing bears they take this season. Moreover, there is a chance that bears taken previous to this season may be barred as well. American clients with polar bear trophies still in Canada or Nunavut need to get those bears home."

The warning was not heeded by everyone. At least 40 Canadian polar bears were killed by U.S. trophy hunters from March until May of 2008—when they were cautioned that the Endangered Species Act would be in effect, disallowing any imports of trophy polar bears.

Now, those polar bear carcasses are collecting dust in refrigerated storage in Canada at great cost to the hunters, who desperately want to bring their trophies back stateside.

"We are disheartened to see this type of legislation introduced in Congress. We have seen it time and time again," says Lena Spadacene, policy manager for wildlife protection at the Humane Society of the United States, which has spearheaded the fight against importing polar bear products.

A similar bill was introduced in the last session of Congress, Spadacene said, but was defeated by a coalition of conservation groups. "We worked diligently on that issue and pulled together one of the most comprehensive reports on trophy hunting and exemptions," she says.

"The law should be consistently applied, and we should not have a special carve-out for a few trophy hunters who shot polar bears in Canada, knowing full well that they

may not be able to import the trophies under U.S. law," the report stated.

"While some argue this is just a small number of trophies, it encourages hunters to continue killing protected species in other countries, store the trophies in warehouses, and simply wait for their allies in Congress to get them a waiver on the imports," the report said. "It sets a dangerous precedent, and encourages more killing of threatened species and protected marine mammals, which flies in the face of the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act."

"We don't want to reward bad behavior," Spadacene says. When the trophy hunters learned that polar bears would be listed as threatened, "they rushed to Canada to bag themselves a trophy, but some of them did not make it in time. Now they are paying money every month for refrigeration until they can lobby their friends in Congress."

It's a worrying pattern, Spadacene says, and it could easily affect other species in the future.

Once it becomes known that a species is about to be put on the endangered list, it motivates some hunters to go out and kill while they still can. And if they miss the deadline, then they hope they can just win an exemption from Washington.

"Passing this legislation now is only going to entice and incentivize the bad behavior even more," Spadacene says.

She adds, "Whenever our elected officials grant special exemptions for trophy hunting, it undermines conservation policy. Shooting an iconic species for display or bragging rights and then crying to Congress for a bailout is simply bad form and should not be tolerated."

Spadacene explains the trophy hunters "were warned of the law and they shot polar bears anyway. If we allow this exemption to happen, we can predict it will happen again with other species, or potentially with polar bears again."

Then there is the question of priorities in Congress. With so many problems vexing the country, is the fate of 40 dead bears really so important that Capitol Hill should vote on this bill?

"The last session was what many considered to be the most ineffective and incompetent legislature in the history of democracy, exactly because they were working on legislation like this," Spadacene says. "It's this kind of special-interest legislation that makes Americans frustrated with Congress. It's so self-serving for a small group of wealthy trophy hunters, and does nothing for the American people or conservation."

Judd Deere, a spokesman for Senator CRAPO, has the opposite take on the matter.

"There is nothing more frustrating for the American people than regulations that make no sense," Deere says. "It's frustrating for these hunters, and it's unfortunately requiring Congress to act. This legislation was a commitment that my boss made in the last Congress. We got really close last time. I hope we can get it done this time."

It is sure to be a bitter battle.

The polar bear legislation "is being cast as a private relief measure to help a few hunters bring in a handful of personal trophies," the HSUS report said. "But in reality it would provide incentive for still more killing of polar bears in Canada, by providing more hope to would-be bear slayers they can convince Congress to amend the law just one more time."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, scientists estimate, as I indicated, that we may lose two-thirds of the polar bear population by 2050. Therefore, we, as custodians of these very precious

animals, should do all that we can to protect a vanishing species from extinction instead of incentivizing trophy hunters to kill as many as possible in advance of pending ESA listings. This is a critical measure to assure the long-term viability of imperiled animals.

Let me also cite for the record that the appeals court upholds Endangered Species Act protections for polar bears.

Let me suggest to my colleagues that we saw an unfortunate circumstance just a few months ago when Cecil the lion was killed out of mistake or I don't know what, but this giant of an animal, this reflection of the idea of the importance of the animal kingdom, was killed.

I introduced H.R. 3448, Cecil the Lion Endangered and Threatened Species Act. It is similar to the amendment I have today. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chair, let me express my appreciation to Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for their leadership and commitment to working to maintain and preserve America's natural resources and wildlife habitat.

I also wish to thank Chairman SESSIONS, Ranking Member SLAUGHTER, and members of the Rules Committee for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3.

Mr. Chair, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3 is an important revision to the SHARE Act because it serves to preserve the original intent of Congress under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as well as the Endangered Species Act.

Specifically, the Jackson Lee Amendment strikes Title III of the underlying bill that creates a loophole in the Marine Mammal Protection Act which would allow a handful of hunters to import polar bear trophies into the United States in contravention of current law.

While H.R. 2406 purports to enhance recreational outdoor opportunities and does in fact have some favorable provisions, Title III, as well as many other harmful provisions make clear, that this legislation would in reality jeopardize already fragile ecosystems and negatively impact animal welfare and wildlife.

As a longstanding member of the Congressional Animal Rights Caucus and champion of wildlife preservation and protection of animals, I am deeply concerned about the harmful provisions of H.R. 2406 and the impact this legislation will have on endangered and threatened populations.

Title III of the SHARE Act is particularly concerning, because it creates a loophole in the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) allowing for a special class of hunters to import polar bear trophies into the United States in contravention of the law.

The MMPA was set up because it was recognized that many marine mammal stocks, including polar bears, were in danger of becoming endangered or extinct.

The sole, most important, objective of the MMPA is to help maintain the health and stability of the ecosystem.

The polar bears for which these hunters seek permits for were hunted in Canada after the species was proposed for listing as threatened under the Endangered Species Act and was done so with full knowledge and warning

that U.S. law would prohibit their eventual importation.

Enacting Title III of the SHARE Act would threaten this imperiled species by encouraging hunters to race for trophies the moment a species is considered for listing under the Endangered Species Act, store them abroad and then seek waivers from Congress to import their trophies later.

Granting such a waiver sets a dangerous precedent and sends signals to trophy hunters that they can flout the law—effectively rewarding hunters who raced to kill polar bears for trophies before their listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Alternately, removal of this language will help ensure that hunters are not encouraged to seek bad faith waivers from Congress to import threatened and endangered species at a later time.

These bears were knowingly hunted in Canada after the species was proposed for listing as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

The survival and protection of the polar bear habitat is an urgent issue for wildlife experts and those who treasure our natural habitat.

H.R. 2406, as it stands, is opposed by virtually every leading environmental organization in the nation.

The Humane Society of the United States, the Humane Society Legislative Fund, and the Humane Society International, as well as several others including the Animal Welfare Institute, Center for Biological Diversity, and Born Free USA have all submitted letters in strong support my Jackson Lee Amendment as a necessary provision to provide real protections for endangered and threatened species.

Earlier this year, I also introduced H.R. 3448, the Cecil the Lion Endangered and Threatened Species Act in response to the tragic killing of Cecil the Lion and the impermeable need for greater protections to shield all threatened and endangered species from trophy-hunting.

You have no doubt heard about the recent tragic illegal killing of Cecil the Lion, a 13-year-old lion, dominant male of his pride, and one of Zimbabwe's most beloved symbols of wildlife and important driver of tourism.

The hunter, along with hired professionals, lured Cecil out of Hwange National Park and shot him, allegedly without a permit, and collected the head and skin.

Beyond Cecil, over two thirds of the world's cat species are recognized as species in need of protection under federal or international law.

My legislation to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973, would prohibit the taking and transportation of any endangered or threatened species as a trophy into the United States.

Currently, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) does not protect the vast majority of wild animals killed and imported by American hunters.

While the ESA allows for the importation of endangered and threatened species for scientific research, propagation or survival of the species, hunters are abusing this limited exception to murder and transport protected wildlife for sport.

As a result of the ESA loophole, tens of thousands of wild animals are killed every year by American trophy hunters and transported into the United States.

In particular, Africa's lion population has declined 90 percent in the past 75 years.

The conservation of rare and threatened species is critically important to the sustainability of our ecosystem and wildlife as we know it.

Polar bears, like African lions, currently face unprecedented threats by humans on two fronts: sport hunting and loss of habitat.

The polar bear and African lion are vulnerable species sitting at the top of the food chain. The health of these animals is an indicator and foundation for the health of the ecosystem as a whole, and by protecting the sustainability of these specific umbrella species, we can have tremendous impacts on entire ecosystems.

The International Union of Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has "Red Listed" polar bears as a "Vulnerable" species—thus, meeting criteria as a threatened species facing a high risk of extinction in the wild.

While Canada is the only country that allows for sport hunting of polar bears, it is unfortunate that what was once a necessity of life for indigenous Inuit communities in Canada, killing polar bears has now become a bloody sport for profit and prestige.

It is estimated there are 20,000–25,000 polar bears left in the wild a number that has only been sustainable through federal protection.

Mr. Chairman, the SHARE Act of 2015, if enacted would continue to threaten the sustainability of one our most vulnerable species as well as the critical preservation of our wildlife.

Scaling back protections on vulnerable and threatened species in the face of legislation aimed to do otherwise will have substantial adverse impacts on wildlife and conservation efforts, as well as policy implications rewarding those who failed to comply with federal law.

We simply cannot afford to let threatened and endangered species die needlessly for sport or profit.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would protect polar bears while at the same time preserving Congress's intent under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

I urge all members to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 3.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate something that Mr. YOUNG said. There is a thousand-dollar importation fee that is assessed on all 41 of those trophies. Those dollars go to polar bear conservation and research. So we are looking to use these efforts to continue the promulgation of this species. We want to make sure polar bear populations continue to grow.

Hunters provide, I believe, the largest measure of conservation of any group out there that is looking to preserve polar bears. It is in everyone's interest to make sure these things happen.

We have a number of groups out there that are in support of this bill: the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Safari Club International, and the Boone and Crockett Club. All those organizations are deeply committed to

making sure that we continue and grow these species.

We want to make sure we understand that, but hunters are the best conservationists on the planet because they are involved in making sure the species continue. They use their resources to put into species continuation. They want to make sure these species are properly managed and that we have good science in managing those species. I believe that this is what we want. We want to make sure that we are encouraging that.

This amendment does not allow us to do that. It strikes those provisions. I would strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, there are a litany of organizations that are supporting this amendment: the League of Conservation Voters, the Alaskan Wilderness League, Animal Welfare League, Born Free USA.

With respect to lions, let me recite that over the last 75 years, we have lost 90 percent of African lions because we did not have the restraints. I would make the argument that we should not do that in this case.

When we let go and let free, we will find out that they will go beyond the 41. They will be calling after polar bears for trophies. We need to ban this in our legislation to ensure the protection of all of those.

Let me ask my colleagues to take into consideration the importance of our responsibilities of preservation.

Trophies? Money?

I can assure you that there are a bounty of humane organizations that will provide any amount of dollars to do the research that is necessary to protect this vulnerable population. They are listed on the Endangered Species Act. They are vulnerable.

These trophies should not be an indication to the American people that they can bring in polar bears—who may themselves become extinct—because we believe that trophies are more important than studying the species and growing the species to the extent that scientists and others can restrain them and make sure that we do have a population within the realm and reason of supporting the ecosystem that we need.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate polar bears are not endangered. They are not on the endangered species list.

I want to remind folks, too, these 41 trophies were harvested in Canada. Canada has a world-class management program for polar bears. They have used the best science.

Remember, these polar bears were taken in 2008, based upon the science

Canada was using to manage the program. The polar bears in Canada, both at the time and now, are increasing in population. Canada does a great job in managing this.

This is just a situation where polar bears legally harvested under the best management programs available should be allowed to come back into the United States. I would encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. 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 gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), I offer amendment No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 19, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 20, line 21, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 20, after line 21, insert the following: “(viii) Administrator of the Small Business Administration or designated representative.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COSTA

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 4 be printed in House Report 114-429 and be modified in the form that I have placed at the desk.

The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. COSTA:

Page 19, line 24, strike “7” and insert “8”.

Page 20, line 19, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 20, line 21, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 20, after line 21, insert the following: “(viii) Administrator of the Small Business Administration or designated representative.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, Representative BUSTOS and I would like to thank Congressmen BEYER and WITTMAN and the Rules Committee for allowing us to present this amendment on the floor.

This amendment would help ensure that the interests of small businesses that rely on wildlife conservation and recreational hunting continue to thrive.

As established by this bill, the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council Advisory Committee’s duties would include advising the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture on policies and programs that help increase the participation in hunting and wildlife conservation activities and promote awareness of the importance of both wildlife conservation and the economic benefits of recreational hunting.

There is no question that recreational hunting has economic benefits. In 2011, hunters put \$38.3 billion into our economy. The small businesses across the country that cater to the needs of these hunters and wildlife watchers—be they stores, hotels, trail guides—are bedrocks of our local economies that are near our public lands. We know that.

□ 0945

As is, however, none of the governmental bodies set to serve on this advisory committee that is being proposed as a part of this legislation represent the perspective or the needs of these small businesses.

Small businesses are the economic engine that is driving our economy. We know that. It has been that way for years. They should not be left behind or be left out of this.

This amendment would simply add the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to be listed as an ex-officio member of this advisory committee.

Having a representative from the Small Business Administration or their designee will strengthen the voice of small businesses that rely on tourism associated with hunting or shooting or sports or recreational or wildlife activities that this legislation intends to promote.

So my colleague, Representative BUSTOS, and I ask that you join us in supporting this small-business amendment ensuring that they have a seat at the table by supporting this effort.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an “aye” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-429.



Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 49, line 20, after the period, insert "Such closures shall be clearly marked with signs and dates of closures, and shall not include gates, chains, walls, or other barriers on the hunter access corridor."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, 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, I rise today in support of the numerous hunters in my district who have called me, very frustrated, every hunting season that the National Forest Service, with no cause, no rationale, and no reason, closes down their access to hunt in the Mark Twain National Forest. With gates, locks and chains, they limit the residents of central and southeast Missouri.

I have been contacted by numerous folks in my district about not having proper postings of corridors within the National Park System whenever they decide to change its random gates. What this amendment would do is it would require the National Forest Service to publish signs of any hunting corridors that they decide to close.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that we support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, 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. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-429.

Ms. MENG. 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 59, line 10, strike "OFFICER" and insert "OFFICERS".

Page 59, beginning at line 16, strike "OFFICER" and insert "OFFICERS".

Page 59, line 20, strike "one".

Page 59, line 21, strike "officer" and insert "officers".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement officers to be placed in diplomatic posts

abroad in an effort to combat the illegal killing of African elephants.

Honestly, this is an activity in which the Fish and Wildlife Service already engages. What the underlying bill does in section 1004, however, which I think is commendable, is explicitly authorizes this activity in law for the first time.

Unfortunately, I feel the authorization is overly narrow because it allows only one FWS officer to be placed in a single country at a time. I think this was likely a drafting oversight and simply wish to allow more than one FWS officer to be assigned to a foreign country at a time.

Let me be clear. This amendment does not mandate that multiple officers be sent abroad. It does not authorize any additional funds for these activities. It does not require an increase in any way on the number of FWS officers placed abroad. It simply allows more than one FWS officer to be placed in a single country at any given time.

In reality, this amendment could, should we wish it, result in a net decrease in the number of FWS law enforcement agents placed abroad, resulting in lowered costs to the U.S. Government for these activities.

Imagine a scenario in which elephant poaching and ivory trafficking was running rampant in 20 different nations and we wished to assist in the combating of these activities by leveraging the expertise and experience of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service officers.

As written, we would only be allowed to place one officer in each country, for a total of 20 total officers deployed internationally.

What if the Secretary of the Interior determined, however, that formulating a task force of five specialists, who would be deployed jointly, as needed, would be the best possible course of action to combat the poaching of African elephants?

As written, the SHARE Act would force this task force to be split up and housed in five different African nations. The amendment before us, however, would permit the entire task force to be housed under one roof.

At the end of the day, housing the entire task force in a single location could be much more effective strategically and could result in significant savings to the U.S. Government if it is housed in the nation with the lowest cost of living.

Mr. Chair, no matter how one may feel about the broader bill before us, I feel that section 1004 of the bill is a worthwhile section. I hope you will support my amendment seeking to improve it.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-429.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title X add the following:

**SEC. — GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study examining the effects of a ban of the trade in of fossilized ivory from mammoths and mastodons on the illegal importation and trade of African and Asian elephant ivory within the United States, with the exception of importation or trade thereof related to museum exhibitions or scientific research, and report to Congress the findings of such study.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment to the SHARE Act to direct the Government Accountability Office to delve deeper into an important issue, and that is the ivory trade, which has sparked international concern.

Last year my home State of California became the third State in the country to approve tougher restrictions on the intrastate ivory trade, joining New York and New Jersey in that regard.

The new California law, AB 96, closes a loophole that had allowed the import of ivory harvested from animals killed before 1977.

Now, this loophole made a ban of the import of elephant ivory nearly impossible to enforce because distinguishing between pre- and post-1977 ivory products would require very expensive isotope testing.

The California law also included a ban on the growing trade in mammoth ivory—this is ivory discovered in Siberia and elsewhere—ironically made easier because of warming weather and melting tundra due to the impacts of climate change.

There is growing concern that Chinese ivory traders are passing off illegal elephant tusks as mammoth ivory in order to avoid international elephant ivory bans.

But distinguishing between mammoth ivory and elephant ivory requires technical testing, which makes, again, enforcement of an elephant ivory ban very difficult unless the mammoth ivory trade is also addressed.

Now, some argue that, despite this difficulty, legal mammoth ivory can reduce the market for illegal elephant ivory. Although I don't agree with that, I do understand the concerns.

That is why, with this amendment, we are simply asking the GAO to study

the issue, to look at what various experts have to say, and give us some advice.

To make smart policy decisions, we need that kind of information on how a ban on the trade of fossilized ivory from mammoths would affect the illegal importation and trade of elephant ivory within the United States.

So I respectfully request your support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would request an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. BEYER. 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:

Beginning at page 69, line 1, strike title XIV.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, title XIV of this bill would give States and territories the authority to override Federal fishing rules in coastal waters of national parks, national marine sanctuaries, and some marine national monuments. This is simply not right.

Places like Biscayne National Park, Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, and Rose Atoll Marine National Monument belong to all Americans, not just to the fishing interests in Florida, Hawaii, and American Samoa.

Protection of these special ocean places has overwhelming public support and is recognized by the scientific community as critical to making fisheries more productive.

What is more, most of these areas do not even preclude fishing. California's national marine sanctuaries generate more than \$140 million a year in economic impact from commercial fishing.

Recreational anglers spend more than \$100 million a year on fishing in the Florida Keys.

I attended the public hearing in Homestead, Florida, last year on closing a very small part—less than 6 percent—of Biscayne National Bay for a marine national monument simply to bring the fish back, many fish that fishermen there hadn't seen in years.

But fishing is not the only important use of these waters. Whale watching, snorkeling, scuba diving, and scientific research all generate enormous benefits, not to mention the impact that protecting coral reefs and other diverse productive habitats has on stabilizing

our oceans and our fisheries in the face of global warming.

Sometimes it is necessary to protect certain areas of the ocean, particularly those that have been over-fished in the past or are particularly sensitive to fishing impacts, if we want to support a wide variety of uses and keep our oceans healthy. Science shows that this benefits fishermen in the long run as well.

My amendment is simple. It strikes title XIV of H.R. 2406 and leaves fishery management decisions in the waters of marine parks, sanctuaries, and monuments up to the Federal agencies charged with managing these resources in trust for all Americans.

We would never think of allowing Wyoming to set hunting rules for Yellowstone, but without this amendment, this bill would allow the same thing to happen for our ocean parks that are every bit as magnificent.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1000

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I noted that one of our principal objectives of the Federal lands policy must be to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to the communities impacted by the Federal lands.

Gifford Pinchot, the founder of the Forest Service, advised his foresters to find out in advance what the public will stand for. If it is right and they won't stand for it, postpone action and educate them.

That is essentially what this bill does. It says that the Federal Government needs to listen to States and territories before imposing fishing regulations in State waters.

This amendment would strip this language and say, in effect: We don't care what local communities think. We know what is best.

It speaks volumes about why States and communities are openly revolting against Federal lands policy.

Pinchot also advised us to get rid of an attitude of personal arrogance or pride of attainment of superior knowledge. I would commend that advice to the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, with respect to my colleague and friend from California, I don't think that is the way the system works.

In fact, right now fishing limitations are developed in coordination with their respective States and territories. They are just not given final, blanket veto power. The Park Service and the States benefit from cooperative fisheries research and management and full participation. My only personal ex-

perience is with the Biscayne Bay where there were many, many public hearings. The public was fully involved. The fishermen, pro and con, were fully involved in it.

The idea is not to eliminate the close coordination of partnership with the States and with the territories, but, rather, to avoid giving the States and territories the ultimate veto power over what essentially are national decisions.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Now, we know the Natural Resources Committee is a rowdy one to manage, with lots of difficult decisions and inflamed passions.

But I thank Chairman BISHOP and the great subcommittee chairmen and all of the members for doing a great job in ensuring that the American people are the ultimate beneficiaries of our amazing public lands and waters.

This title XIV language that would be stripped out of the underlying bill by this amendment was taken from my bill, the Preserving Public Access to Public Waters Act, which has 36 bipartisan cosponsors, including nearly two-thirds of the Florida delegation.

Floridians understand the importance of balancing environmental, recreational, and economic considerations along our coast because our State is the fishing capital of the world.

With that balance in mind, we worked to carefully develop and tailor this language so that it would only apply to a very small area of near-shore waters with deep importance to fishermen.

My colleague and this amendment's sponsor himself said in the committee markup that the National Park Service and the National Marine Sanctuaries cover a negligible percentage of waters within traditional State jurisdiction.

He is right that we are talking about a relatively small area, but these waters have outsized importance to the folks living in nearby communities.

In my district, the National Park Service is attempting to close over 30 percent of Biscayne National Park's reefs to fishing in perpetuity as part of its new general management plan and in opposition to the scientific and management expertise of the FWC, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

FWC has worked for over a decade to develop mutually agreeable and scientifically supported fishing restrictions that stop short of a full closure in these waters, but the National Park Service has completely disregarded the State's authority to manage its own fishing resources in Biscayne National Park.

Rather than work with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Committee, what did the National Park Service do? It decided to abdicate its responsibility to the American public to try to balance environmental, recreational, and economic considerations.

Instead, the National Park Service kowtowed to the whims of a single special interest group that bankrolled tens of thousands of form letters from across the country to hijack the public comment section in favor of closing fishing access to State waters upon which local fishermen depend.

That is not the proper use of the public comment process. It is not in the best interests of south Floridians. It is not in the best interests of the American people. It is not reflective of how we should manage public waters.

Let me be clear. The title XIV language in this bill is narrowly targeted. It is simply to keep States involved in the management of their own waters. It does not apply in any way to Federal waters. This language is not anti-environment. It does not roll back any existing environmental protections nor fishing regulations currently enshrined in law.

Without keeping this language in the bill, Mr. Chairman, the example that the National Park Service is setting in Biscayne National Park will create a terrible precedent for other State and territorial waters in similar circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of our colleagues to oppose this harmful amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The gentleman from Virginia has 2¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response and with respect to my friend, the representative from Florida, Biscayne Bay National Park is 164,800 acres. These are Federal lands. This is a national park, Federal waters.

She mentioned that only they are going to close 30 percent of the reefs. It is very important to note that the reef that existed 100 years ago is down to only 6 percent that is left. So the 30 percent that is going to be closed is 2 percent of the original reef.

The whole purpose is to actually serve that special interest, the fishing interest of Florida, who desperately need the revival of the fish.

We found at the public hearing that at least half of the fishermen there were for closing it, and all the fishermen pointed out that the water was so far away, it was rarely fished at all. The worry was the precedent, not the specific part that is closed.

We point out that Biscayne Bay itself is only less than 2 percent—1.4 percent—of all Florida's waters. So this is a very tiny part. But the point here is not for any special interest, but to re-

verse, because study after study after study have shown that where these marine sanctuaries are created, the fish recover much faster even than scientists expected.

This is for the long-term benefit of the fishing community, for anglers throughout the world, especially serving the larger interests of the American public.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important amendment. We resist giving veto power over Federal decisions to State governments and territorial governments.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BEYER. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-429.

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 71, Line 13, insert "the Mark Twain National Forest in the State of Missouri," after "Mississippi."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, 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, the great outdoors and hunting traditions of the United States are a way of life for folks all over our great country.

Throughout our history, they have been championed by Presidents George Washington, Dwight Eisenhower, and Teddy Roosevelt, who established national forests, game preserves, and national parks. The SHARE Act continues these great traditions.

My amendment, which adds Mark Twain National Forest to the list of forests provided in the section, assures the residents of Missouri that no executive order, no executive action, or no bureaucrat sitting in Washington, D.C., who has never set foot on Mark Twain National Forest will write a rule inhibiting the ability to hunt or fish in our national forests.

This amendment secures our freedom to be avid sportsmen. Folks in Missouri

don't want an overzealous administration to be able to come in and dictate to the hunters and anglers of Missouri by executive fiat.

Over 1.3 million Missourians hunt or fish, and many go to the Mark Twain National Forest each year. It covers roughly 2,331 square miles, 1.5 million acres, most of which reside in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District.

I ask the body to support the amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposing this amendment, first and foremost, because it, like so many provisions already in the bill, seeks to prevent U.S. public lands from being managed for the benefit of all Americans.

National forests are lands of many uses, including hunting and fishing. But how those uses are balanced should be decided by expert land managers at the Forest Service through a process that is open to the public and consistent with our national conservation laws, not by a few well-connected hunters and their allies in Congress.

Furthermore, the practice that this section of the bill is trying to protect is using dogs to hunt deer. Not only is this an ethically questionable hunting tactic, it is wildly controversial in the States listed in this title as well as in my State of Virginia.

Its opponents, Mr. Chairman, are not who you might think. These are not what was described yesterday as radical leftists. In fact, it is the complaints from private landowners and not overbearing bureaucrats, not environmentalists, that led the Forest Service to ban deer hounding in Louisiana's Kisatchie National Forest in 2012.

Don't take my word for it. A 2014 column in Louisiana Sportsman stated:

The boot that finally stamped the life out of deer hunting with dogs in Kisatchie National Forest was trespassing on private property . . . homeowners reported people standing on the public roads in front of their homes with guns, waiting for deer to appear. They reported dogs on their property sometimes attacking their chickens or other livestock. And, worst of all, the homeowners reported belligerent and insolent behavior by these people standing on the roads and entering their property to retrieve their dogs.

Missouri's Mark Twain National Forest, the subject of this bill, was the scene of a major law enforcement action that found 46 people guilty of illegally hunting deer with dogs in 2013, this in spite of the fact that the practice had already been banned in Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that is a commonsense amendment that prevents discrimination against hunters on public Federal lands by preventing the Forest Service from creating their own hunting laws that are in conflict with State laws on neighboring State and privately owned lands.

Mr. Chairman, for many people, the public lands on the national forests are the only place they have to hunt. There are many traditions and many different ways that people enjoy hunting in the outdoors in my State as well as others.

We already have similar language in the bill for national forests in Louisiana, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Arkansas, and I support adding the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri to this bill.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to emphasize that the Forest Service doesn't prohibit hunting right now in the Mark Twain National Forest. It simply prohibits hunting deer with dogs.

It does this because of complaints from private landowners, not from the environmentalists and not from bureaucrats. This is literally respect for the public input that comes from that.

I continue to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just a commonsense amendment that adds the Mark Twain National Forest to the several other forests that are mentioned in the four other States.

I ask the body to support the amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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:

After section 1502, insert the following:

**SEC. 1503. PUBLICATION OF CLOSURE OF ROADS IN FORESTS.**

The Chief of the Forest Service shall publish a notice in the Federal Register for the closure of any public road on Forest System lands, along with a justification for the closure.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

□ 1015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2406, the SHARE Act, and urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

This amendment is very straightforward. It simply requires the Forest Service to publish a notice in the Federal Register along with a justification explaining the decision for the closure of any public road on Forest Service lands.

Some of you may ask why this amendment is necessary, and that is understandable because, fortunately, many Americans have never had to deal with this issue. However, in my district in the Pacific Northwest and in many Federal forests across the country, many people have faced the reality that a public road that they have used for decades is suddenly closed. When I say "closed," if I could refer your attention to this photograph, there is a picture indicating that a road is no longer even available for use. It is not just a chain going across the road.

However, the reality is far worse. When the Forest Service closes many of these public roads, they do so by piling gravel, downing trees, or both, in order to block access. At other times, they create what are called tank traps, essentially large ditches dug into the ground that makes passage impossible. Furthermore, these practices create impediments that not only block human access but can also restrict the movement of wildlife in our national forests.

This has become a serious issue in central Washington. For many people who use these roads, it can have detrimental impacts on their everyday lives, whether by making their daily travel much longer or by restricting access to campsites or treasured areas in our national forests.

Some of these roads have been in use for 70 or 80 years, with generations of Washingtonians using them for forest access and recreation. Yet, in most cases, the Forest Service has closed them without even first notifying local residents and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the first indication of a public road being closed should not come when an individual or a family is faced with an impassable roadway, but rather through adequate public notice from the Forest Service. That is why I have introduced this amendment today.

Just to be clear, my amendment simply requires the Forest Service to provide notification when closing a public road on Forest Service land as well as justification for such a decision. This is an important first step in ensuring that rural communities and residents are given proper warning and advance notice when a public roadway will suddenly be blocked and access to a Federal forest area will no longer be available.

Local residents and communities deserve to know when such an action is taking place and whether forest action will be denied. This amendment will guarantee the Forest Service is being transparent in future decisions and closures.

Mr. WITTMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. NEWHOUSE for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, rural communities deserve better from their government. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment Mr. NEWHOUSE on introducing this amendment.

These roads were built with taxpayer dollars, yet the Forest Service arbitrarily goes in and shuts those roads down so people don't have access to them.

We have the same problem in our forests in Alaska: no notification, and then they will spend millions of dollars closing down a road that the public had access to. Their excuse is: well, it is our land. We don't have to worry about other people using this road now, so we will just isolate everybody from it.

So I compliment the gentleman for the introduction of his amendment.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the good gentleman from Alaska.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in ambivalent opposition to my friend's amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to let Representative NEWHOUSE know I completely appreciate the dilemma that he is in and appreciate the motivation for this amendment.

My one concern is that it will require the chief of the Forest Service to publish notice in the Federal Register, along with a justification, any time a national Forest Service road is closed, and there may be some unintended consequences which we should at least think about.

For example, the amendment will require the Forest Service to publish the

Federal Register notice to close a road that is being engulfed by wildfire, or a road that is covered with debris after a tornado or in jeopardy of being swept away after a landslide, a power line down on the road, or even one that is closed to prevent militants from coming and going, as we have recently seen.

I certainly am sympathetic to the idea that there should be a justification for anything that closes a public road that people have used for many, many years, but I also don't want to hamstring them from closing roads that are necessary for the public safety.

I tepidly encourage a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would only say that since this is a bill, the SHARE Act, about public access, about use of our treasures, our national forests and public lands, all we are asking from the Forest Service is a little bit of transparency, notice so that people aren't caught off guard. Certainly there are extenuating circumstances where notice, if there is a downed power line or debris is in the middle of a road that makes it impassable, it seems to me that is a time when notice is even more necessary and imperative for the public good.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but would still urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-429.

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:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE XVII—UTILITY TERRAIN VEHICLES**  
**SEC. 1701. UTILITY TERRAIN VEHICLES IN KISATCHIE NATIONAL FOREST.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Forest Administrator shall amend the applicable travel plan to allow utility terrain vehicles access on all roads nominated by the Secretary of Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries in the Kisatchie National Forest, except when such designation would pose an unacceptable safety risk, in which case the Forest Administrator shall publish a notice in the Federal Register with a justification for the closure.

(b) UTILITY TERRAIN VEHICLES DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term "utility terrain vehicle"—

(1) means any recreational motor vehicle designed for and capable of travel over designated roads, traveling on four or more tires with a maximum tire width of 27 inches, a maximum wheel cleat or lug of  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an inch, a minimum width of 50 inches but not exceeding 74 inches, a minimum weight of at least 700 pounds but not exceeding 2,000 pounds, and a minimum wheelbase of 61 inches but not exceeding 110 inches;

(2) includes vehicles not equipped with a certification label as required by part 567.4 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(3) does not include golf carts, vehicles specially designed to carry a disabled person, or vehicles otherwise registered under section 32.299 of the Louisiana State statutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, 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 rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 2406, the SHARE Act, which would allow hunters better access to and from hunting areas in the Kisatchie National Forest in northern Louisiana.

The Louisiana Legislature passed House Bill 581 by Louisiana Representative James Armes in 2015. This new State law would allow municipalities to designate certain local roads for use by utility terrain vehicles, also known as UTVs or side-by-sides. These are not to be confused with ATVs, or all-terrain vehicles. They are larger, weigh more, seat multiple passengers, and are often equipped with safety features like roll cages, seatbelts, and enclosed cabs.

My amendment would build on the Louisiana law to allow seamless access from these designated local roads into hunting areas within Kisatchie National Forest. The size of these vehicles makes them more difficult to transport when compared with ATVs. The ever-increasing list of features for UTVs makes them very attractive to hunters in order to recover game and transport supplies and equipment.

This amendment would allow the Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to nominate roads that would be opened in the Kisatchie Forest travel plan, unless the Chief of the Forest Service determined that such an opening would pose an unacceptable safety risk. If so, the Forest Service would have to publish a justification in the Federal Register as to why the road could not be opened.

I believe my amendment strikes the right balance of public safety and hunter access, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM), my good friend.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, Dr. FLEMING, for introducing this very important amendment. He and I both know that hunting is a major part of Louisiana's heritage and culture. In Louisiana, hunters themselves are usually the best steward of our environment.

This amendment would give authority to the Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to nominate roads that could be open for utility terrain vehicles in the Kisatchie National Forest.

Like Dr. FLEMING said, these vehicles have a minimum footprint and are much safer than our traditional ATVs. They are often used by hunters to re-

cover game and carry supplies and equipment in and out. For far too long, they have been prohibited from sharing municipal roads with other users.

Dr. FLEMING's amendment would simply make Federal law more consistent with existing State laws of Louisiana where these UTVs are commonly used in a safe and responsible manner. This would allow hunters greater access to roads within the Kisatchie Forest travel plan.

If the Chief of the Forest Service determined that opening a road to UTVs would pose an unacceptable safety risk, then they would have the authority to override this nomination. However, they would be required to publish their justification in the Federal Register. This is important to ensure transparency and accountability in the Federal decisionmaking process.

The Kisatchie National Forest is one of Louisiana's national treasures. The citizens of Louisiana should not be unnecessarily limited in how they can use this beautiful public space.

I urge my colleagues to support Dr. FLEMING's amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to be debating two doctors on one amendment.

I do think that one of the dilemmas here is that this amendment, like so much of H.R. 2406, the SHARE Act, continues the essential idea that we should be turning over decisions that have been made at the Federal Government level by the National Park Service, by the Bureau of Land Management, and by the Forest Service to State governments and even to local governments.

This is not a debate on UTVs. I respect that automobiles and all kinds of transportation continue to evolve. Rather, it is the idea that we are setting a damaging precedent with regard to our conservation laws and regulations that again and again we are saying that, rather than taking a national perspective, we are turning to the local folks to decide what works best for the country.

This amendment allows the State of Louisiana, not the Forest Service charged with managing the Kisatchie National Forest for the benefit of the American people, to determine where and whether it is permissible to chase down deer with motorized vehicles. These are thoughtful rules established through an open, public process. They seek to balance multiple uses and prevent abuses in our national forests.

The fact that this amendment focuses on off-road vehicles brings to mind the illegal 2014 ATV ride through Recapture Canyon in Utah. That is the last thing we want to happen in Kisatchie National Forest.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and the precedent that it would set.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say in rebuttal to my good friend that it is very interesting the radical environmental lobby wants to set aside the forest for the enjoyment of humans. The only problem is they cut off all access through their lobbying power by humans to this valuable land, like Kisatchie National Forest.

If we are going to have a national forest set aside for the American people, let the American people enjoy it. As such, they can't get in there without some type of vehicle. If they have game, they can't get the game out unless they have some type of vehicle.

As for the Forest Service, yes, of course, the Forest Service opens for public comment, but they still do what they want to do anyway. That is the whole problem.

It is time that we allow the American people to step forward and speak in favor of their lifestyles, particularly the hunter lifestyle, the "Sportsman's Paradise" lifestyle that we enjoy in Louisiana.

Mr. WITTMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would just simply like to close and say let's think about the American people, and let's give the American people access to the valuable and beautiful land that we have here in this Nation.

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.

□ 1030

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. GRIFFITH. 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 the following:

**TITLE XVII—INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION**  
**SEC. 1701. INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 926A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

**"§ 926A. Interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition**

"(a) Notwithstanding any provision of any law, rule, or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof:

"(1) A person who is not prohibited by this chapter from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm or ammunition shall be entitled to transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the firearm to any other such place if, during the transportation, the firearm is unloaded, and—

"(A) if the transportation is by motor vehicle, the firearm is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the vehicle, and, if the vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the firearm is in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console, or is secured by a secure gun storage or safety device; or

"(B) if the transportation is by other means, the firearm is in a locked container or secured by a secure gun storage or safety device.

"(2) A person who is not prohibited by this chapter from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm or ammunition shall be entitled to transport ammunition for any lawful purpose from any place where the person may lawfully possess, carry, or transport the ammunition, to any other such place if, during the transportation, the ammunition is not loaded into a firearm, and—

"(A) if the transportation is by motor vehicle, the ammunition is not directly accessible from the passenger compartment of the vehicle, and, if the vehicle is without a compartment separate from the passenger compartment, the ammunition is in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console; or

"(B) if the transportation is by other means, the ammunition is in a locked container.

"(b) In subsection (a), the term 'transport' includes staying in temporary lodging overnight, stopping for food, fuel, vehicle maintenance, an emergency, medical treatment, and any other activity incidental to the transport, but does not include transportation—

"(1) with the intent to commit a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year that involves the use or threatened use of force against another; or

"(2) with knowledge, or reasonable cause to believe, that such a crime is to be committed in the course of, or arising from, the transportation.

"(c)(1) A person who is transporting a firearm or ammunition may not be arrested or otherwise detained for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof related to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms, unless there is probable cause to believe that the person is doing so in a manner not provided for in subsection (a).

"(2) When a person asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the prosecution shall bear the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the conduct of the person did not satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (a).

"(3) When a person successfully asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the court shall award the prevailing defendant a reasonable attorney's fee.

"(d)(1) A person who is deprived of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by this section, section 926B or 926C, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or any political subdivision thereof, may bring an action in any appropriate court against any other person, including a State or political subdivision thereof, who causes the person to be subject to the deprivation, for damages and other appropriate relief.

"(2) The court shall award a plaintiff prevailing in an action brought under paragraph

(1) damages and such other relief as the court deems appropriate, including a reasonable attorney's fee."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended in the item relating to section 926A by striking "firearms" and inserting "firearms or ammunition".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, this is a civil liberties amendment. It clarifies and strengthens existing Federal law.

The amendment is necessary, unfortunately, because while the underlying law protects a traveler who is transporting a firearm under the Federal regulations that the firearm has to be locked in a proper container and out of the reach of the person if he is in a car, et cetera, in one's traveling from State A to State B, sometimes on the way from State A, where the gun is lawful, to State C, where the gun is lawful, one must pass through State B, where the gun may or may not be lawful.

What we have found is that, notwithstanding the fact that it is lawful in State A and is lawful in State C and is protected by Federal law while being transported, some State and local governments have decided that they are not going to follow the Federal law, and they end up arresting the otherwise law-abiding traveler. We have examples of this. It is not just that they are out and are necessarily looking for the traveler, but there are circumstances that occur.

One example that happens fairly frequently is that an airline passenger has done everything he is supposed to have done in that he has followed all of the security rules. Then, for reasons beyond his control, his flight in State B is missed. So he has traveled lawfully and he has checked his gun lawfully, he has done everything he is supposed to have done, but when he gets to the lay-over terminal, his flight is either already gone or it has been canceled.

In one case in particular, the gentleman was told "you need to go a hotel. Take your bags. Come back the next morning." When he went back the next morning, he was arrested by State law enforcement individuals because his gun was not legal, notwithstanding the fact that he had done everything he was supposed to have done.

In another very tragic situation, a gentleman was traveling from New Jersey to South Carolina. He was a veteran, so he stopped off in Washington, D.C., at Walter Reed, to see one of his doctors. He was lawfully transporting the firearm under Federal law and he was arrested.

Now, while most of these cases end up getting worked out either as a misdemeanor or by some other arrangement, it is still a great impediment on the traveler to use the Federal law lawfully.



This amendment says if that happens, if one is stopped by the State or the local government, that the prosecutor in that State or local area must prove his case beyond a reasonable doubt that this individual was not following the Federal law. It sounds like a pretty reasonable American principle.

If it is determined that the traveler was lawful and was actually arrested and has to go to court to defend himself, the court will award attorneys' fees to that individual.

We are just trying to make him whole. We are not paying him for the time he served in jail. We are not paying him for the fact that his vacation plans or his travel plans were disrupted. We are just saying that there ought to be something that tells the local and State governments that you ought not do this again or you are going to pay this gentleman or this gentlewoman her attorneys' fees.

To me, that is taking care of civil liberties and is making sure that the people who are following the law are not wrongfully arrested without their having any recourse. I see this as a civil liberties amendment.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would weaken current law, undermine State laws concerning the carrying of firearms, and harm the efforts of law enforcement to take action against illegal firearms trafficking.

Current law applies only to the transportation of a firearm in a motor vehicle. This bill would expand current law to allow a person to transport a gun outside a motor vehicle so long as the firearm is unloaded and locked in a container or is secured with a safety device. This would allow a person to walk down the street with an unloaded gun as long as the gun had a trigger lock on it, regardless of the State's laws on carrying guns in public.

This amendment would also allow guns on trains, cable cars, and trolleys so long as the guns are unloaded and locked, regardless of State or local laws. This is because trains, cable cars, and trolleys are not considered to be motor vehicles under the applicable Federal definition. Current Federal law gives State governments the authority over firearms in these forms of transportation, but the Griffith amendment would remove that authority.

The proposed amendment would also have a negative impact on our law enforcement officers' ability to enforce our gun laws. Specifically, this amendment would make it more difficult for

officers to investigate suspected gun traffickers and people who illegally carry weapons.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Police Foundation.

STATEMENT OF THE POLICE FOUNDATION REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SPORTSMAN'S BILL (HR 2406), FEBRUARY 25, 2016

The Police Foundation expresses its grave concerns with a proposed amendment to the Sportsman's Bill (HR 2406), by Congressman Morgan Griffith from Virginia, which will have a chilling effect on enforcement of illegal gun possession and other gun crimes. We strongly oppose the amendment's provision that could make law enforcement agencies liable for investigative stops and detentions of armed subjects.

Further, the proposed amendment will drastically undermine states' concealed carry licensing laws. States must be able to determine their own concealed carry statutes and regulations that fit the values and enhance the safety of their communities and constituents.

At a time when many cities and counties have just witnessed 2015 come to an end with increased homicides and non-fatal shootings, Congress should strengthen, not weaken enforcement of our nation's gun laws.

We call on Members of Congress to support law enforcement officers as they perform the most dangerous job of confronting shooters and other armed criminals, and to uphold state and local efforts to make communities safer.

We urge Members of Congress to oppose the proposed amendment.

Mr. BEYER. The letter expresses the Police Foundation's grave concerns with this amendment. They write that this amendment "will have a chilling effect on the enforcement of illegal gun possession and other crimes."

Why would Congress narrow the limited set of enforcement tools our police officers currently have to pursue suspected gun traffickers?

The Griffith amendment subjects a police officer to a personal lawsuit when he or she detains or arrests someone whom the officer reasonably believed at the time of detainment was illegally trafficking or was carrying a firearm.

We must respect our officers' ability to use discretion, albeit limited, when determining if gun trafficking is occurring; so subjecting them to personal lawsuits when they are simply trying to do their jobs to protect us seems a little reckless. These brave men and women should not be afraid to carry out their investigative duties due to the fear of being sued.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman brought up the dilemma that this amendment would pose for law enforcement. It would, shockingly, actually, impose individual penalties on law enforcement officers who are

just trying to do their jobs but who might mistakenly detain someone in connection with his possession of a firearm if he were transporting it in a way that is protected under this amendment.

This is going to have a chilling effect on law enforcement's ability to protect Americans from gun trafficking, to make us safer at a time when there are more guns in the hands of more people than ever before, when we have more accidents, when we are experiencing a tragic gun violence epidemic.

I am also concerned that this amendment goes a little further than just being a narrow cleanup of the anecdotal stories we heard about travelers who were inconvenienced or detained. As I read the amendment, it not only would allow a person to walk down the street with an unloaded gun, as long as that gun had a trigger lock on it—regardless of State law, regardless of any local rules that may be in effect—it would allow one to take that gun onto trains, cable cars, and trolleys even if local jurisdictions prohibited that. Again, so long as the gun had a trigger lock in place.

Now, in my district we had a tragic incident a couple of years ago in which a young teenager had a toy AK-47, and law enforcement believed that it was an actual gun that was threatening members of that community. They fired shots that took that young man's life. Imagine the dilemma, whether intended or unintended, as a consequence of this bill, and people could suddenly go into parks or even onto public transportation with real AK-47s.

What kind of dilemma would law enforcement face?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you that I am really surprised that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle aren't supporting this civil liberties amendment. Clearly, they have misinterpreted the amendment.

First of all, it only applies if somebody is lawfully transporting a gun—where it is lawful in State A to another State where it is lawful. If you are going to be on a trolley car or on a cable car, you have to be transporting that gun from one State to another and it has to have been lawful to begin with and lawful at the terminus. It is only in the interim that that would be an issue.

I would say to the gentleman that this is not about any kind of personal lawsuits against law enforcement officers. It says the court shall award attorneys' fees against the local government or the State that is prosecuting the individual. I would also say to the gentleman that it is only for wrongful arrest.

I practiced criminal law for 28 years. There is a huge difference between detention, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have alleged this bill would affect, and arrest. This bill does not do one single thing. They are simply mistaken on detention. It doesn't do anything. If you want to

stop somebody, if you want to investigate, he may miss his flight. Arrest means one has been placed into custody, has been taken down to the station, has been booked, and is having to post bond.

That is what this bill deals with. When someone is wrongfully arrested, when he has been following the Federal law, he should, in fact, have his attorneys' fees restored to him. It is reasonable attorneys' fees. It is not whatever—the sky and the Moon—the attorney might ask for. A court determines if they are reasonable attorneys' fees.

This is just a small measure to make sure that when somebody makes a mistake and a local government goes forward with a prosecution, that you get some of that back. We are not paying you for being in jail. We are not paying you for being arrested. We are not paying you for having your rights taken.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that we are certainly not objecting to reasonable attorneys' fees and to making people whole. It is the idea that law enforcement officers can be held personally responsible and can be, actually, personally sued for doing their jobs that we object to.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) very much. I sit on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman who is the proponent of the legislation that, first of all, we have a responsibility to keep law and order; we have a responsibility to protect the Second Amendment; and we have a responsibility to law enforcement officers.

Tragically, in the backdrop of this debate was an individual who secured guns and killed and slaughtered people just last night. We want to make sure that we are safe and that we are dealing with issues that are important to protecting our law enforcement.

First of all, this amendment is unnecessary. Current Federal law already entitles a person to transport a firearm from one place to another so long as the firearm is unloaded and the needs of the firearms or any ammunition being transported is not readily accessible or directly accessible from the passenger compartment, et cetera.

This amendment intends to make a Federal open carry law. This open carry law should be one of the State's determinations. It happens to exist in the State that I am from. It should not be placed upon the entire country by Federal law.

Why?

Because whether a gun is supposed to be locked or has a trigger on it, it still poses a threat, possibly, to our law enforcement.

I oppose this amendment because it is unnecessary and because it puts our law enforcement persons in danger.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment and acknowledge the shooting in Kansas as evidence that we don't need more guns being carried back and forth on the streets.

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

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

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

Mr. BEYER. 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 Virginia will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HARDY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), I offer amendment No. 13.

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 XVII—GOOD SAMARITAN SEARCH AND RECOVERY

##### SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act".

##### SEC. 1702. EXPEDITED ACCESS TO CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE.—The term "eligible", with respect to an organization or individual, means that the organization or individual, respectively, is—

(A) acting in a not-for-profit capacity; and  
(B) composed entirely of members who, at the time of the good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission, have attained the age of majority under the law of the State where the mission takes place.

(2) GOOD SAMARITAN SEARCH-AND-RECOVERY MISSION.—The term "good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission" means a search conducted by an eligible organization or individual for 1 or more missing individuals believed to be deceased at the time that the search is initiated.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable.

(b) PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Secretary shall develop and implement a process to expedite access to Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for eligible organizations and individuals to request access to Federal land to conduct good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The process developed and implemented under this subsection shall include provisions to clarify that—

(A) an eligible organization or individual granted access under this section—

(i) shall be acting for private purposes; and  
(ii) shall not be considered to be a Federal volunteer;

(B) an eligible organization or individual conducting a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section shall not

be considered to be a volunteer under section 102301(c) of title 54, United States Code;

(C) chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the "Federal Tort Claims Act"), shall not apply to an eligible organization or individual carrying out a privately requested good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section; and

(D) an eligible organization or entity who conducts a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section shall serve without pay from the Federal Government for such service.

(C) RELEASE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM LIABILITY.—The Secretary shall not require an eligible organization or individual to have liability insurance as a condition of accessing Federal land under this section, if the eligible organization or individual—

(1) acknowledges and consents, in writing, to the provisions described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of subsection (b)(2); and

(2) signs a waiver releasing the Federal Government from all liability relating to the access granted under this section and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the United States from any claims or lawsuits arising from any conduct by the eligible organization or individual on Federal land.

(d) APPROVAL AND DENIAL OF REQUESTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall notify an eligible organization or individual of the approval or denial of a request by the eligible organization or individual to carry out a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section by not later than 48 hours after the request is made.

(2) DENIALS.—If the Secretary denies a request from an eligible organization or individual to carry out a good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission under this section, the Secretary shall notify the eligible organization or individual of—

(A) the reason for the denial of the request; and

(B) any actions that the eligible organization or individual can take to meet the requirements for the request to be approved.

(e) PARTNERSHIPS.—Each Secretary shall develop search-and-recovery-focused partnerships with search-and-recovery organizations—

(1) to coordinate good Samaritan search-and-recovery missions on Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary; and

(2) to expedite and accelerate good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission efforts for missing individuals on Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall submit to Congress a joint report describing—

(1) plans to develop partnerships described in subsection (e)(1); and

(2) efforts carried out to expedite and accelerate good Samaritan search-and-recovery mission efforts for missing individuals on Federal land under the administrative jurisdiction of each Secretary pursuant to subsection (e)(2).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a critically important amendment being offered by my friend and colleague from Nevada, Congressman JOE HECK.

This amendment would ensure the inclusion of the text of H.R. 373, the Good

Samaritan Search and Recovery Act of 2015, in the underlying bill.

The Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act, of which I was an original cosponsor, is a commonsense, bipartisan solution to tearing down the bureaucratic roadblocks that are preventing grieving families from achieving closure when their loved ones go missing on Federal lands.

□ 1045

This issue was first brought to light by the separate, but tragically similar, cases in Las Vegas of the taxi driver Keith Goldberg and Air Force Staff Sergeant Antonio Tucker.

Mr. Goldberg and Staff Sergeant Tucker were missing and presumed dead, with their remains believed to have been missing somewhere within the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

In both cases, the local, experienced search and recovery groups volunteered their time and resources to help locate the remains of the missing individuals.

Unfortunately, due to the unnecessary bureaucratic hurdles from the Federal Government, the group volunteering to help locate and recover Mr. Goldberg's remains was denied access to the Park Service land to conduct its search for 15 months and the group volunteering to help locate the remains of Staff Sergeant Tucker were denied access for 10 months, needlessly delaying the closure their families sought. This is absolutely unacceptable, and it must change. This amendment will do that.

Once these bureaucratic hurdles were finally cleared and the Good Samaritan search and recovery groups were allowed access to the park, Mr. Goldberg's remains were recovered in less than 2 hours and the remains of Staff Sergeant Tucker were recovered in less than 2 days.

Dr. HECK, a former member of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's search and rescue team, originally introduced this legislation because he could no longer stomach the cases where unnecessary red tape continued to get in the way of providing closure for families faced with tragically similar circumstances.

During the 113th Congress, a similar bill passed the House with a unanimous vote of 394-0, further proving its bipartisan support. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to take action on the measure. Last April the House again passed this important legislation 413-0.

Mr. Chairman, those are two votes on this Good Samaritan bill totaling 807 in favor and none opposed. Given our current political climate, it just doesn't get more bipartisan than that.

We cannot afford to let the Senate's inaction get in the way of achieving this critical fix that will provide closure for so many Americans. We must pass this amendment so that future families won't have to suffer the mental anguish and heartache that the families of Keith Goldberg and Antonio Tucker did.

In closing, I again thank my colleague from Nevada for offering the amendment that will truly help the people we serve.

I also thank the chairman and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee for all their diligent work in the Good Samaritan Search and Recovery Act.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nevada. I urge my colleagues to strongly support this amendment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. RIBBLE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to 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 —GRAY WOLVES**

**SEC. .01. REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULE REGARDING GRAY WOLVES IN THE WESTERN GREAT LAKES.**

Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance shall not be subject to judicial review.

**SEC. .02. REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULE REGARDING GRAY WOLVES IN WYOMING.**

Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rule. Such reissuance shall not be subject to judicial review.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

I am proud today to offer the only bipartisan amendment that has been found in order on this bill. I am really proud, after working in Congress now for three terms, that Members from both the majority and the minority have come together in an effort to protect the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment speaks directly to the issue of gray wolves protected by the Endangered Species Act in the western Great Lakes region of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota, as well as Wyoming.

There was a period of time that the gray wolves had become almost extinct in these areas and the scientists at the Fish and Wildlife Service decided to protect them from extinction by listing the gray wolf as an endangered species.

That work was so successful that, in 2011, the Fish and Wildlife Service decided to de-list the gray wolf. In fact, there are now hundreds of mating pairs in these regions. However, those wolves have created some problems.

In spite of this remarkable recovery, in spite of how robust this is, a surprise Federal court ruling took place in 2014 and invalidated the scientists at the Fish and Wildlife Service who were given the responsibility under law of the Endangered Species Act to manage this population.

So my amendment is simple. It just simply restates and delists the wolves in these four States only. That is what my amendment does. It protects the Endangered Species Act and the scientists who work at the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, that was extraordinary. We are here to protect the Endangered Species Act by preempting litigation for violations of the Endangered Species Act. That is pretty extraordinary.

I mean, we are not only having Groundhog Day here—because this bill has passed three times before and failed to receive any consideration in the Senate and the same thing will happen yet again with this bill—but now we are wandering into Alice in Wonderland. That is extraordinary.

Yes, the Fish and Wildlife Service did delist in the States the gentleman mentioned, but they required that each of those States adopt scientifically based management plans.

Well, the scientifically based management plan in Wyoming is open season on wolves. Let's try and exterminate them again. There has also been a tremendous loss of population in a number of the other States that the gentleman referred to.

So a judge has found that they violated the Endangered Species Act because they didn't adopt scientifically based management plans.

You know, these are horrible predators, as you can see here. They are very, very fierce. They are, of course, responsible for huge, huge, unbelievable—big, as Donald Trump would say, really big—depredation on cattle.

Let's look at the causes for loss of cattle. Well, let's see. Seventy-four percent died because of health issues—perhaps we need a little education on husbandry for some of our ranchers—7.8 percent died due to weather—well,

we are not having climate change; so, there is nothing we can do about the weather. We don't want to mess with that—2.7 percent is due to other predators, mostly coyotes.

Animal damage control, now renamed very aptly Wildlife Services, has killed well over a million coyotes. And guess what. There are more coyotes now, more distributed than when they started trying to exterminate them.

The wolves are in a much more fragile place. They are responsible for 0.9 percent of the depredation, and they are at critical population levels. They were required to keep 10 breeding pairs in Wyoming. Boy, that is a lot of wolves in a State the size of Wyoming, 10 breeding pairs.

Well, they violated that, and that is why the judge made this ruling. Now we are being told we are here to protect the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD, in light of the gentleman from Oregon's comments, a letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service supporting this amendment.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,  
Bloomington, Minnesota, January 30, 2015.  
Hon. REID J. RIBBLE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RIBBLE: Thank you for your January 16, 2015, letter to U.S. Fish

and Wildlife Service (Service) Director Dan Ashe and to me regarding the Service's views on the status of gray wolf populations in the states of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, as well as our view on state management of gray wolves since the Western Great Lakes Distinct Population Segment (DPS) was removed from Endangered Species Act protection in 2011. An identical letter is being sent to each member who signed the original correspondence. Director Ashe has asked that I respond on his behalf.

Most of the information provided below is taken from the 2014 report on post-delisting status of gray wolves in the Western Great Lakes DPS (enclosed). Enclosed, you will also see our gray wolf post-delisting monitoring plan for the Western Great Lakes DPS.

Our post-delisting monitoring plan used the recovery goals in the 1992 Recovery Plan for the Eastern Timber Wolf to identify the population characteristics that needed monitoring as well as to identify circumstances that could prompt closer scrutiny by the Service and potential consideration of re-listing. Those circumstances include the following:

A decline that reduces the combined Wisconsin-Michigan (excluding Isle Royale and the Lower Peninsula) late winter wolf population estimate to 200 or fewer wolves;

A decline that brings either the Wisconsin or the Michigan (excluding Isle Royale and the Lower Peninsula) wolf estimate to 100 or fewer wolves; and,

A decline that brings the Minnesota winter wolf population point estimate or lower end of the 90% confidence interval to 1500 or fewer wolves.

Since delisting in 2011 through the winter of 2013–2014, numbers of wolves in the three states remained well above established recovery goals (Table 1). Population surveys are conducted by the three states in late winter after hunting and trapping seasons and before the birth of pups in the spring. Thus, the surveys are conducted at a time that the wolf population is at its lowest level during the annual cycle.

TABLE 1.—RECENT POPULATION ESTIMATES FOR GRAY WOLVES IN MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, AND WISCONSIN. INCLUDED IS THE LAST POPULATION ESTIMATE COMPLETED BEFORE THE WOLF WAS DELISTED AND TWO ESTIMATES COMPLETED AFTER DELISTING.

State	Gray Wolf Population Estimates		
	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Michigan .....	687	602–714	594–678
Minnesota .....	2,921 (2007–2008)	2,211	22,423
Wisconsin .....	815–880	809–834	660–689

Differences in the trends of wolf numbers among the three states are likely due to different levels of human-caused mortality (Table 2). Also, it is suspected that a decline in white-tailed deer may have played a role in the initial decline of Minnesota wolves after delisting (Table 1). Regardless of the different trends, the wolf population remains well above the original recovery goals for the entire population and within the individual states. In Michigan and Wisconsin, there were at least 594 and 660 wolves, respectively, in early 2014 and the number of wolves in Minnesota appears to have stabilized at around 2400 wolves (Table 1).

TABLE 2.—WOLF DEATHS CAUSED BY TWO SOURCES OF HUMAN CAUSED MORTALITY, CONTROL OF DOMESTIC ANIMAL DEPREDATION AND HARVEST BY HUNTERS AND TRAPPERS, IN THE WESTERN GREAT LAKES DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT DURING THE PERIOD WHEN WOLVES IN THE REGION WERE NOT LISTED AS ENDANGERED OR THREATENED, 2012–2014.

State	2012			2013			2014		
	Depredation	Harvest	Total	Depredation	Harvest	Total	Depredation	Harvest	Total
Michigan .....	17	No season	17	10	23	33	13	No season	13
Minnesota .....	295	413	708	127	238	365	211	272	483
Wisconsin .....	76	117	193	65	257	322	35	154	189

The relationship between human-caused mortality and wolf population numbers is well established and evident in the population trends among the three states. In Wisconsin, 14% of the population was harvested by hunters and trappers in 2012, yet no change in wolf numbers was detected in the subsequent survey completed during late winter of 2012–2013 (Tables 1 and 2). In 2013, 32% of the population was harvested and the wolf population declined by about 18%. In Minnesota, the decline of the population between 2007–2008 and 2012–2013 was 24 to 25% and was likely caused by hunter/trapper harvest, depredation control, and a 23% decline in deer between 2007 and 2012. In response to the wolf population decline, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources reduced wolf harvest levels and the population appears to have stabilized. In Michigan, human-caused mortality of wolves by hunters and for depredation control has been relatively minor after delisting and the Michigan wolf population has shown no significant change (Tables 1 and 2).

Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin have managed wolves according to state wolf management plans that the Service evaluated as part of our decision to delist the species in 2011. Our evaluation led to a determination that each state's plan provided for the long-term conservation of a viable wolf population in the region. The state management plans and our evaluation acknowledged that the states could carry out regulated harvests after delisting. In the final rule to

delist the Western Great Lakes DPS we made the following comment:

“Unregulated killing was the primary threat to the species historically. The State management plans that will be implemented after delisting provide protection from unregulated killing. It is not the Service's position to decide whether a regulated harvest in and of itself is an appropriate management tool. Instead the Service is concerned with whether the use of that tool might reduce the number of wolves in such a way that they would again be considered a threatened or endangered species under the Act. A regulated harvest of wolves can be carried out in a manner that would not threaten their continued existence.”

Since delisting, the states have demonstrated effective management to ensure wolf populations remain viable.

We value the cooperation and contributions that state and tribal biologists have made to ensure that the Service could monitor the post-delisting status of wolf populations. Staff from each Department of Natural Resources has been highly responsive to our requests for information, even after the wolf was relisted. We believe that each state has demonstrated an ability to respond to the challenges that are unique to conservation of wolves in the wild. Moreover, they have done so in ways that demonstrate their intent to maintain the wolf as a viable component of their ecosystems.

Thank you for your concerns regarding the wolf and its status. If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to con-

tact Mr. Peter Fasbender, Field Supervisor for our Twin Cities Ecological Services Field Office.

Sincerely,

THOMAS O. MELIUS,  
Regional Director.

HON. REID J. RIBBLE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC.

HON. DAN BENISHEK,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, DC.

MEGAN KELHART,  
Division of Congressional  
and Legislative Affairs,  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
Service, Washington,  
DC.

Mr. PETER FASBENDER,  
Field Supervisor, Twin  
Cities Ecological  
Services Field Office,  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
Service, Bloomington,  
MN.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, I am just stunned by the misrepresentations of the previous opponent of this bill. Let me show you what is going on really.

Here is the habitat of the wolf. Clearly, it is not endangered. On the red list, it is considered a species of least concern.

Let's look at the habitat of the Shiras moose. This is Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and going into Montana. The Shiras moose is in rapid decline, and it is because of this critter.

Now, the gentleman from Oregon showed you little puppies as if they do no damage. Look at this moose. This Shiras moose is surrounded by wolves, and they are attacking that baby.

The reason this is such a big issue is they are wiping out the babies. So there is no longer a breeding population of moose or elk in major areas of this country, including the Lolo elk herd in Montana and the moose around the Greater Yellowstone area in Wyoming.

It is these baby moose they are after. They surround the mother. Two of them distract the mother. The rest of them take the babies.

There are not enough breeding females left. So when the older females age out of the population, there are no breeding females to take their place. It is the wildlife that is getting decimated, Mr. Chairman. This is a wildlife issue.

To save the moose, I strongly encourage the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, actually, I think wolves are part of wildlife. I heard a mention of Montana Yellowstone.

Actually, in Yellowstone, the rivers were in horrible, horrible condition because all of the browse that was being done by elk and other critters right down into the streams. Fish populations were crashing. The water was too hot and lost all of the riparian cover.

Now you find we have restored balance because there are wolves there and the elk and others stay in herds and they stay in the forest. They don't go down and stomp around in the streams.

Natural balance is sometimes problematic. The gentlewoman showed a picture of a moose under attack. Fairly natural.

I don't believe that that is the total cause for the problems with the moose population. In fact, those moose are still hunted. So I guess we need to save the moose from the wolves so the hunters can hunt the moose.

So I am on the side of the wolves on this one. I think most American people would like to see this iconic predator restore balance.

Coyotes are three times the predators on cattle. If you want to protect cattle, guess what. Wolves kill coyotes. But when you don't have wolves, the coyotes spread and take over.

The gentlewoman showed Russia and China and then Canada and a few other areas on a map. Those aren't gray wolf populations in many of those areas.

I don't know what Siberian wolves look like, but I don't think that—since the land bridge went away, whenever that was, they haven't been coming to the United States. And I don't know about Chinese wolves. I don't know anything at all about Chinese wolves.

I do know that wolves here are in a fragile state of recovery. If you hunt them back to extinction, which is what basically is going on in Wyoming, or you hunt below the levels for sustainable populations, as some of these other States are doing with trophy hunting and that, then we are going to be back where we started with the wolves being extinguished in the lower 48 and more coyotes.

Maybe you will have some more moose. Maybe the elk can go back in the streams in Yellowstone. They probably miss thrashing around in there and eating all the riparian cover.

I think that this amendment, to substitute political science for sound science and for Congress to preempt litigation with this, is somewhat unprecedented, to say the least.

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have not mentioned protecting cattle at all. Maybe some of my colleagues will. I have only mentioned trying to protect the Endangered Species Act.

□ 1100

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for this amendment and the time.

I rise today in support of this amendment for the SHARE Act. This amendment directs the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to reissue a rule to delist the gray wolf in Wyoming and the Great Lakes region, which includes my State of Michigan.

In 2011, the Fish and Wildlife Service determined that the wolf recovered in Wyoming and the Great Lakes and would remain recovered under federally approved State management plans.

I can speak from personal experience about the impact that wolves and their recovery are having on my district. This photo next to me is of a constituent in my district. One of his calves was attacked and eaten by a wolf, which may not mean much to the opponents of this, but it means pretty much to small farmers in Michigan. It isn't just the cattle.

As the number of wolves have increased well beyond the recommended number for recovery, we have seen drastic declines in the deer population in northern Michigan. My camp has no deer. The economy of the whole area is in collapse because there is no hunting anymore.

I understand that some are opposed to ever delisting the wolf, but as num-

bers continue to expand, we must consider the impact the wolf has on the landscape as a whole. This amendment does not change the Endangered Species Act. It simply allows for the following of true sound science.

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

Mr. RIBBLE. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BENISHEK. The gray wolf was recovered in the Great Lakes and ready for delisting and State management.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I will go ahead and close.

About two decades ago, there were only 15 gray wolves in the western Great Lakes States. Today the gray wolf population exceeds 3,700, and yet we are to act as if some judge someplace decides that that is not enough, that the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Wyoming in and of themselves cannot manage these populations in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife's actions and with their scientific help.

This is not unprecedented, as the minority has mentioned. This exactly has happened with Montana and Idaho before.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Ribble, Lummis, Benishek, and Peterson amendment.

Managing gray wolves continues to be a huge problem in my state of Minnesota. In spite of the overwhelming evidence by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that the gray wolf population in the Western Great Lakes States has not only recovered, but thrived in the past few years, a single judge in Washington, D.C. unilaterally decided that gray wolves somehow need federal protection. In 2014, Minnesota had nearly 2,500 gray wolves, by far the highest number in any state besides Alaska.

This has put the farmers and ranchers in my district in a very difficult situation. They are now forced to choose between following the law or protecting their livestock and livelihoods. Our amendment simply reinstates Fish and Wildlife's original decision to delist gray wolves in the Western Great Lakes States from Endangered Species Act protections and allows the agency to relist gray wolves if science supports it. I believe this amendment is scientific and fair.

This is a real problem that needs immediate solution. The states—not the federal government—are best equipped to manage gray wolf populations and provide assistance when problem wolves harass my constituent's livelihoods.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. 01. PROHIBITION ON ISSUANCE OF FINAL RULE.**

The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall not issue a final rule that—

(1) succeeds the proposed rule entitled “Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska” (81 Fed. Reg. 887 (January 8, 2016)); or

(2) is substantially similar to that proposed rule.

**SEC. 02. WITHDRAWAL OF EXISTING RULE REGARDING HUNTING AND TRAPPING IN ALASKA.**

The Director of the National Park Service shall withdraw the final rule entitled “Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves” (80 Fed. Reg. 64325 (October 23, 2015)) by not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall not issue a rule that is substantially similar to that rule.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman. Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a relatively complicated amendment in the sense that a lot of people don't have any history of the Alaska National Lands Act.

My amendment prohibits the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service from issuing a final ruling that would seize authority from the State of Alaska's Alaska Fish and Game to manage fish and game on all lands. That was under ANILCA.

My amendment also withdraws the existing National Park Service rule that interferes with State wildlife management authority under the National Preserve Lands of Alaska, agreed to by this Congress. The Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act, ANILCA, passed by Congress, signed into law in 1980, protects the ability of the State of Alaska to manage wildlife across the State on State, private, and Federal lands.

As Alaska's lone Representative and someone who was intimately involved in the process of producing ANILCA, an agreement with my colleagues, it is my conclusion that the proposed rule set forth by the Fish and Wildlife Service

and Park Service is in clear violation of Federal law.

The scope of the proposed Fish and Wildlife Service rule is enormous. There are 76.8 million acres of wildlife refuges in Alaska, an amount of land about the size of four Michigans, at least two or three Virginias, and on top of that there is 20 million acres of national preserves in Alaska, a total of 100 million acres in the State of Alaska.

But when that agreement was set out, we were to retain management of fish and game on all lands, and that is in the law. Very frankly, my colleagues, this is a regulatory overreach by this administration, promoted by this administration, breaking the law.

Now, the Fish and Wildlife Service asserts their actions are allowed by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act. However, as the original sponsor of that act, I can knowingly and affirmatively state that the Fish and Wildlife Service proposal goes beyond the original intent of my legislation that was passed by this House.

The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act specifically states that ANILCA takes priority over any other conflicts regarding refuge lands in the State of Alaska. I find it somewhat concerning that the Fish and Wildlife would cite a law which forbids them from taking such actions and then say the justification is because of the law. It is not. This is a special interest pressuring group that says that Fish and Wildlife will take away the States' rights.

If you believe in States' rights, you will take and support this amendment that I am offering. If you believe in the Federal Government only, not the United States of America, the United States as the Federal Government, you will oppose this amendment.

I am asking my colleagues to think about what is occurring here: the overreach of this Federal Government that has taken away the rights of States and is continuing to try to do it.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOMACK). The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, with nothing but the deepest respect for my colleague from Alaska—and I even want to tell him, I was afraid to stand up without getting clearance from one of your other good friends, the resident hunter in my household—but this amendment is yet another attempt to allow a State to override perfectly reasonable conservation policies on U.S. public lands.

This amendment would prevent the Park Service from managing wildlife on these lands, even though they are owned by the American taxpayers, not by the State of Alaska.

Of particular concern is Alaska's policy of eradicating keystone predator

species. Because of this policy, allowing wolves and bears to seek refuge on these Park Service lands may be the only way to keep them from requiring protection under the Endangered Species Act.

I want to be clear about what this rule does and does not do. It does not deny access to hunting. This rule does not reduce hunting in the national preserves in Alaska, period. In fact, it keeps existing hunting rules in place.

What the rule does do is ban some of the most inhumane and ecologically damaging forms of hunting, things that a true sportsman would never do anyway. Let me share examples. This rule would prevent spotlighting black bears and shooting them and their cubs, babies in their den. It would prevent using bait to attract and kill bears. It would prevent killing wolves during their denning season. Again, babies. And it would prevent the killing of caribou from a motorboat while under power. Yes, if a deer is swimming and you go after it in a boat, it would prevent that caribou that is swimming from being shot.

If you think people should be allowed to do any of these what I think are un-sportsmanlike things, then this amendment is for you. But if you are like most Americans, you will be deeply disturbed by these practices and will join me in opposing this amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I remind my good friend from Michigan—and she is a dear friend and her husband is a dear friend of mine, he voted for my bill, ANILCA—it is the law. It was an agreement that the State would manage.

By the way, it is against the law to shoot species of animals from a boat. This doesn't change that. It changes the management concept. It is overreach by the Federal Government. It is overreach by Fish and Wildlife. They would not be fish and wildlife managers anymore. They are becoming the preservationist group without the management ability in the State that lives there.

I am not changing anything other than just the fact that the State still has authority under ANILCA. He voted for it. I am suggesting, respectfully, if you want the Federal Government to manage everything, 100 million acres that we agreed that we could manage in the ANILCA law, the State, if you want the government to take that all over, let's just give the government all the land. Let's stop having free land.

You talk about being public land, the public that lives there, they want the State to manage the land. So far they have done a great job.

As far as shooting bears, that is against the law in the State of Alaska.

Now, why are we saying that?

Because it is emotionally acceptable. So let's stick to the facts. This is a fact.

Do you want the administration, the government to manage all lands or do



you want to follow the law that we passed in this Congress?

The law.

We have a tendency here to forget what happened, this Congress. Look at the history of ANILCA. It was a compromise. A lot of it I objected to, but we passed it in this House and it was accepted by the State with the understanding that the State would manage fish and game and not the Federal Government.

By the way, the Park Service in the State of Alaska, the Fish and Wildlife in the State of Alaska, in the beginning the BLM are not partners anymore. It is all run from Washington, D.C.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but the utmost respect for my colleague from Alaska. I actually think that he and my spouse share the same sportsmanship policies of hunting, but this rule just simplifies and updates procedures for closing an area or restricting an activity. It updates obsolete subsistence regulations and it prohibits very specifically some of these things that I spoke about. I think we will respectfully disagree.

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

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

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

Mrs. DINGELL. 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 Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-429.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE —PRESERVATION OF ARCTIC COASTAL PLAIN AS WILDERNESS**

**SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the "Udall-Eisenhower Arctic Wilderness Act".

**SEC. 02. FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Americans cherish the continued existence of expansive, unspoiled wilderness ecosystems and wildlife found on their public lands, and feel a strong moral responsibility to protect this wilderness heritage as an enduring resource to bequeath undisturbed to future generations of Americans.

(2) It is widely believed by ecologists, wildlife scientists, public land specialists, and other experts that the wilderness ecosystem centered around and dependent upon the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, represents the very epitome of a primeval wilderness ecosystem and constitutes the greatest wilderness area

and diversity of wildlife habitats of its kind in the United States.

(3) President Dwight D. Eisenhower initiated protection of the wilderness values of the Arctic coastal plain in 1960 when he set aside 8,900,000 acres establishing the Arctic National Wildlife Range expressly "for the purpose of preserving unique wildlife, wilderness and recreational values".

(4) In 1980, when the Congress acted to strengthen the protective management of the Eisenhower-designated area with the enactment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487), Representative Morris K. Udall led the effort to more than double the size of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and extend statutory wilderness protection to most of the original area.

(5) Before the enactment of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the House of Representatives twice passed legislation that would have protected the entire Eisenhower-designated area as wilderness, including the Arctic coastal plain.

(6) A majority of Americans have supported and continue to support preserving and protecting the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, including the Arctic coastal plain, from any industrial development and consider oil and gas exploration and development in particular to be incompatible with the purposes for which this incomparable wilderness ecosystem has been set aside.

(7) When the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1980 by paragraph (2) of section 303 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 94 Stat. 2390; 16 U.S.C. 668dd note), subparagraph (B)(iii) of such paragraph specifically stated that one of the purposes for which the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is established and managed would be to provide the opportunity for continued subsistence uses by local residents, and, therefore, the lands designated as wilderness within the Refuge, including the area designated by this title, are and will continue to be managed consistent with such subparagraph.

(8) Canada has taken action to preserve those portions of the wilderness ecosystem of the Arctic that exist on its side of the international border and provides strong legal protection for the habitat of the Porcupine River caribou herd that migrates annually through both countries to calve on the Arctic coastal plain.

(9) The extension of full wilderness protection for the Arctic coastal plain within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will still leave most of the North Slope of Alaska available for the development of energy resources, which will allow Alaska to continue to contribute significantly to meeting the energy needs of the United States without despoiling the unique Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States—

(1) to honor the decades of bipartisan efforts that have increasingly protected the great wilderness ecosystem of the Arctic coastal plain;

(2) to sustain this natural treasure for the current generation of Americans; and

(3) to do everything possible to protect and preserve this magnificent natural ecosystem so that it may be bequeathed in its unspoiled natural condition to future generations of Americans.

**SEC. 03. DESIGNATION OF ADDITIONAL WILDERNESS, ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, ALASKA.**

(a) INCLUSION OF ARCTIC COASTAL PLAIN.—In furtherance of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), an area within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in the State of

Alaska comprising approximately 1,559,538 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—1002 Area Alternative E—Wilderness Designation" and dated October 28, 1991, is hereby designated as wilderness and, therefore, as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The map referred to in this subsection shall be available for inspection in the offices of the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the area designated as wilderness by subsection (a) in accordance with the Wilderness Act as part of the wilderness area already in existence within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, there are some iconic places in this country that define America. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in northeastern Alaska is one of those places. It is a one-of-a-kind treasure.

Today, for the first time, the full House of Representatives has an opportunity to cast a vote to permanently preserve and protect this special place.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), my Republican friend, has joined me in introducing the underlying bill that is incorporated in this amendment. Together, we are carrying the torch that prior generations of bipartisan leaders have carried. They have understood that America's Arctic is a uniquely wild place.

It was Republican President Dwight Eisenhower who first established Federal protections for the coastal plain in 1960 and Democratic Chairman Mo Udall who expanded the refuge, doubling its size in 1980.

I had the great privilege to visit the Arctic Refuge last summer. I camped in the wilderness and I came away with an increased sense of urgency to permanently protect the Arctic Refuge's coastal plain.

Allowing drilling in the Arctic Refuge would irreparably disrupt a very important ecosystem. It would impact the way of life for the Gwich'in people and forever destroy one of our Nation's last great wild places. That is why I am offering this amendment to the SHARE Act, to ask that we protect this American wilderness once and for all.

My amendment would designate the threatened biological heart of the refuge, the coastal plain, as wilderness, to finally recognize the intrinsic value of this land and what it holds to ensure that it remains pristine for generations to come.

Congress has been debating whether to drill in this area for nearly three decades. As our public lands suffer from the effects of climate change, most significantly in Alaska, I believe time is of the essence.

Now, the Arctic Refuge is wild, it is spectacular, and most importantly, it

is owned by all Americans, not by the oil industry. That is why Congressman FITZPATRICK and I introduced our bipartisan legislation to permanently designate it as wilderness, following the bipartisan legacy that this legislation has enjoyed for decades.

□ 1115

Arctic Refuge support has always been diverse and nationwide. During the recent public comment period for the draft conservation plan, the Fish and Wildlife Service received nearly 1 million comments in support of wilderness for the Arctic Refuge and in opposition to oil and gas exploration and development. Alaskans showed overwhelming support at public hearings and sent thousands of comments, including from 100 businesses across the State from Kaktovik to Juneau.

This legislation has been introduced in every Congress for almost three decades and has never come to a full vote on the House floor. I am grateful that, in January of 2015, for the first time, the Department of the Interior released a conservation plan for the Arctic Refuge that recommended wilderness protection—a recommendation that was transmitted to Congress.

Only Congress can act to designate the coastal plain as wilderness. Now is the time to seize that historic opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I always admired my friend from California, who doesn't know squat about the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. That is the truth. He may have camped out in it, but he didn't camp out in the area which we would like to drill for oil, which this Congress set aside for that purpose.

By the way, we did pass opening ANWR 11 times. This Congress did it. And it got stopped in the Senate every time but one. Bill Clinton, bless his heart, vetoed it.

We have 18 billion barrels of oil—that is a minimum estimate—74 miles away from an existing pipeline on the coastal plain.

You say, well, we don't need the oil now. I heard that in 1960. We didn't need the oil, but it went all the way up to \$4.50 for gasoline at the pump.

This is a reserve set aside by Scoop Jackson—a Democrat—myself, and Ted Stevens so it would be potentially there for development when Congress acts. You want to include this as a wilderness area in the bill on the behalf and behest of a group of people that really don't understand this.

You say Alaska supports your amendment? In that case, I won't be back here next year. Don't applaud. Don't keep that in mind. I have been running, now, longer than anybody in this House except for one other man. Apparently, Alaska does support this ANWR provision.

It is Federal oil. It is not our oil. We have infrastructure in place right now that can be used to move that oil if and when it is needed.

I am glad the gentleman said only the Congress can designate this, because your Fish and Wildlife Service recommended it all be wilderness—another act of this administration.

I happen to agree, very frankly, that the Congress will vote some day.

And, by the way, if you want to get rid of me, take a vote to open it up, and I might retire. But until that time, I am staying here, because it is right for this Nation.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would forbid development of one of the most promising and untapped oilfields in the world. I have to ask: How is the cause of American energy independence advanced by forbidding development of America's own vast energy resources? We are talking about reserves that are larger than the reserves in the entire nation of Mexico or Norway, whom we currently depend on for importing oil.

The gentleman from California is right: that land is owned by the American people. So is the oil under it. That means about \$300 billion of revenues into the Federal Treasury. That is about \$2,400 for every family in this country.

The proposed development of the Arctic oil requires about 2,000 acres out of 19 million acres of the wildlife reserve. That is one-one hundredth of 1 percent of that land area. That is how extreme this measure is.

It would sacrifice American prosperity. It would sacrifice oil reserves larger than those in all of Mexico. It would sacrifice revenues to the Treasury of \$2,400 for every family to place off limits a tiny part of the frozen Arctic tundra.

If you want to know why our economy is stagnating, if you want to know why our country is going bankrupt, you need only look to measures like the amendment before us.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the senior legislator from Alaska, I have no doubt that he knows and understands the coastal plain and that area far better than I do and that anyone else in this body does, but I do know this: every Member of this body—in fact, every American—has a stake in protecting the coastal plain of the Arctic wilderness.

Migratory birds from the coastal plain go to all 49 of the other States. We are connected, whether we know it or not, with this critical, vital ecosystem in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

The whole point of wilderness is to protect areas that we actually may never camp out in, that we may never see, but that are, nevertheless, of such great intrinsic value that they deserve

this special protection. That is what this is all about.

As to the argument that we need lots of new oil extraction and development in the Arctic, I would just point out that right next door to the Arctic Refuge is an enormous, essentially equal-sized area that we set aside for that purpose. It is called the National Petroleum Reserve. The oil industry has not seen fit to develop in that area, nor does it look like they will any time soon, with oil hovering around \$30 a barrel and this week the Saudis saying they may be taking it all the way down to \$20 a barrel.

Right now, because of its overdependence on the oil economy, the State of Alaska is hemorrhaging. Oil revenues are down by half. The permanent fund is hemorrhaging. Meanwhile, the tourist economy, which is built around preserving and protecting natural resources, is growing and will soon eclipse oil revenues in terms of the economic impact.

Let's look to the future.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I always listen to these well-written arguments by the Sierra Club and others that like to take this Nation to its knees, which is a reality.

We talk about the petroleum reserve set-aside. It was a reserve set aside for use by this Nation. And they are drilling. They are drilling today. ConocoPhillips is going in.

Ironically, for some reason, the sales that were put up by this administration are not where they wanted to drill. I have an old saying—and people laugh at me when I say it: you don't hunt rabbits on a pool table just because it is green. All right. You don't drill oil if it is not there.

Ironically, this administration, bless their hearts, put up sales where there was nothing there. It was like the pool table. So why would the oil company drill? They can't and will not.

And I always ask them: Why don't you ask the oil companies where they would like to drill? We can't do that because someone has asked us to preserve that great area. The other area is just as pretty, but it doesn't have any oil.

This is an attempt to take 18 billion barrels of oil away from the American people and an attempt by special interest groups to make sure this country cannot grow.

Oil will be here forever. Let's keep it. Let's oppose this amendment. It is mischievous. It is wrong for this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR.  
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114-429.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. 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 the following:

**TITLE —MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PERIODIC INCREASE IN PRICE OF MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING AND CONSERVATION STAMP TO ACCOUNT FOR INFLATION.**

Section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “The Postal” and inserting “Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), the Postal”; and

(2) by adding at the end of the following:

“(d) INCREASE IN PRICE OF STAMP.—

“(1) INCREASE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may, after notice and public comment, increase the price of each stamp sold under this section by an amount not to exceed \$10 for a hunting year if the Secretary determines the increase—

“(A) is commensurate with the level of inflation as determined by the adjustments in the Consumer Price Index since the last increase; and

“(B) is approved unanimously by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF INCREASE.—An increase in price under paragraph (1) shall take effect—

“(A) no earlier than 2 years after the effective date of the last increase in price; and

“(B) no later than January 1 of the calendar year preceding the hunting year.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 619, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would simply allow the price of the Federal duck stamp to be changed by the rate of inflation.

Inflation is something that each and every one of us cannot avoid. Just as inflation decreases the value of a dollar for all Americans over time, it also steadily decreases the real value of a duck stamp. That is very unfortunate, because the duck stamp is a highly effective conservation program.

The revenue from the Federal duck stamp that all hunters must buy each year as a permit to hunt waterfowl is used to preserve wetlands and maintain a sustainable population for hunters and bird watchers alike.

Moreover, the preservation of wetland habitat from the duck stamp, in conjunction with the National Wildlife Refuge System, has reversed the decline in waterfowl populations across this country. Also, not insignificant,

co-benefits are that these wetlands buffer our communities from flooding, saving billions of dollars in damages, and they help filter water and recharge. Mr. Chair, aquifers that are vital to our groundwater supplies.

The duck stamp works. Ninety-eight cents of every dollar spent on a duck stamp goes back to preserving wildlife habitat. To date, more than \$800 million from duck stamp sales have been spent on the preservation of over 6 million acres of habitat. The duck stamp is a true user fee, where all the funds are spent to benefit the fee payer.

I hope this is an amendment that the chairman can support as a common-sense update to address the reality of inflation that inevitably will erode the ability of the duck stamps and the National Wildlife Refuge System to continue this highly successful conservation program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognize for 5 minutes.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the gentleman from California that the duck stamp program is a great program. It does a tremendous amount of good. We all know the wetlands that are preserved with that. We all know it is a great opportunity for the hunting community and the conservation community to come together.

As you know, last year, the duck stamp fee was increased, for the first time in 24 years, from \$15 to \$25. I, myself, am an avid duck hunter. I buy multiple duck stamps because I firmly believe in the program.

The increase last year we believe will yield about \$119 million over 10 years; but we also know, looking historically, that when you put these increases in fees, for the first couple of years the revenue drops because people that would buy them without the need don't do that, and then they come back to actually purchasing it.

So we understand that. That is why we have asked the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to look specifically at how the implementation of this fee is going to play out and how the costs associated with the program are, so that we can understand how to best manage this, as you said, to get the most dollars to wetlands conservation.

With the idea of now going to an inflationary factor right on the heels of a \$10 increase without getting, from the Fish and Wildlife Service, what the impacts are going to be so we can best maximize the dollars, I think, is premature.

I serve as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and still, I believe the responsibility for any type of increases should still be on the backs of all Members of Congress, not just the four that are on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

I applaud the gentleman's effort to draw attention to the duck stamp pro-

gram. We all understand the good it does, but I would argue that this inflationary increase measure is premature, especially in the face of a \$10 increase last year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, it is unfortunate that we can't come together today to support such a simple fix to, as Mr. WITTMAN pointed out, such a highly successful program. I think the operative word that you have said is that it is premature at this point, not that you really oppose the ability to protect our waterfowl populations to keep them vibrant and make sure that duck hunters have ducks to hunt. I think we all agree upon that.

I also just want to say that the one issue is just to make clear that we are not talking about automatically increasing inflation. All we are saying is that when inflation does come—which will erode this program—that there is a process in place that the Secretary of the Interior will make a recommendation to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. That Commission has to support it. At most, it would have been a 35-cent increase.

□ 1130

But I hear what you are saying about that, and if you will work with me as we go forward to see when is the best time that we can work on this, I will ask to withdraw this amendment.

Can I get a commitment that we will work together?

Mr. WITTMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WITTMAN. Yes, I will tell the gentleman from California that we will indeed work with you in looking at the future of the duck stamp program, making sure that it is managed in the proper way, making sure that, indeed, is getting dollars to where they need to go, and that is to preserve those critical wetlands.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-429 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. RIBBLE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 244, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—161

Adams	Farr	McDermott
Aguilar	Foster	McGovern
Bass	Frankel (FL)	McNerney
Beatty	Fudge	Meng
Bera	Gabbard	Moore
Beyer	Gallego	Moulton
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Nadler
Bonamici	Graham	Neal
Boyle, Brendan	Grayson	Nolan
F.	Green, Al	Norcross
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bustos	Hahn	Pascrell
Capps	Heck (WA)	Payne
Capuano	Higgins	Pelosi
Cárdenas	Himes	Perlmutter
Carney	Hinojosa	Peters
Carson (IN)	Honda	Pingree
Cartwright	Huffman	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Israel	Poliquin
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Ciçilline	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Clay	Keating	Richmond
Cleaver	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kildee	Ruiz
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Conyers	Kuster	Rush
Courtney	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larson (CT)	T.
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lee	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Levin	Schiff
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Delaney	Lipinski	Serrano
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	Lofgren	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Sires
Deutch	Lowe y	Slaughter
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Speier
Doggett	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Dold	Luján, Ben Ray	Takai
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Takano
F.	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Duckworth	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	Carolyn	Titus
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Eshoo	Matsui	Torres
Esty	McCollum	Tsongas

Van Hollen	Velázquez	Waters, Maxine	Roby	Sessions	Westmoreland
Vargas	Visclosky	Watson Coleman	Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Veasey	Wasserman	Welch			
Vela	Schultz	Yarmuth			

NOES—244

Abraham	Grothman	Paulsen
Aderholt	Guinta	Pearce
Allen	Guthrie	Perry
Amash	Hanna	Peterson
Ashford	Hardy	Pittenger
Babin	Harper	Pitts
Barr	Harris	Poe (TX)
Barton	Hartzler	Posey
Benishak	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Renacci
Black	Hudson	Ribble
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Blum	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Bost	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Bucshon	Jolly	Rothfus
Burgess	Jones	Rouzer
Byrne	Jordan	Royce
Calvert	Joyce	Russell
Carter (GA)	Katko	Salmon
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kind	Schweikert
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Scott (VA)
Coffman	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, David
Collins (GA)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Knight	Shimkus
Comstock	Labrador	Shuster
Conaway	LaHood	Simpson
Costa	LaMalfa	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Long	Stefanik
Curberson	Loudermilk	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stutzman
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Dent	Lummis	Thornberry
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tiberi
DesJarlais	Marchant	Tipton
Donovan	Marino	Trott
Duffy	Massie	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McCauley	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Walberg
Engel	McKinley	Walden
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Fincher	Rodgers	Walorski
Fleischmann	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meadows	Walz
Flores	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Messer	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Williams
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mullin	Wittman
Gibson	Mulvaney	Womack
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gosar	Newhouse	Yoho
Gowdy	Noem	Young (AK)
Granger	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Zinke
Griffith	Palmer	

NOT VOTING—28

Waters, Maxine	Watson Coleman	Welch	Yarmuth
Paulsen	Pearce	Perry	Peterson
Pittenger	Pitts	Poe (TX)	Posey
Price, Tom	Ratcliffe	Reed	Reichert
Renacci	Ribble	Rice (SC)	Rigell
Roe (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rohrabacher
Rokita	Rooney (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam
Ross	Rothfus	Rouzer	Royce
Russell	Salmon	Sanford	Scalise
Schweikert	Scott (VA)	Scott, Austin	Scott, David
Sensenbrenner	Shimkus	Shuster	Simpson
Sinema	Smith (MO)	Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Stefanik	Stewart	Stivers
Stutzman	Thompson (PA)	Thornberry	Tiberi
Tipton	Trott	Turner	Upton
Valadao	Wagner	Walberg	Walden
Walker	Walorski	Walters, Mimi	Walz
Weber (TX)	Webster (FL)	Wenstrup	Westerman
Whitfield	Williams	Wilson (SC)	Wittman
Womack	Woodall	Yoder	Yoho
Young (AK)	Young (IA)	Young (IN)	Zeldin
Zinke			

Waters, Maxine	Roby	Sessions	Westmoreland
Watson Coleman	Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Welch			
Yarmuth			

□ 1151

Messrs. MULLIN, COLLINS of New York, REICHERT, NEUGEBAUER, DENT, and BISHOP of Utah changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. POLIQUIN, COHEN, CROWLEY, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 92 on H.R. 2406, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 242, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

AYES—159

Adams	Doggett	Lawrence
Aguilar	Dold	Lee
Bass	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Beatty	F.	Lieu, Ted
Bera	Duckworth	Lipinski
Beyer	Edwards	Loeb sack
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lofgren
Bonamici	Engel	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	Lowe y
F.	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Brady (PA)	Farr	(NM)
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bustos	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Capps	Fudge	Lynch
Capuano	Gabbard	Maloney,
Cárdenas	Gallego	Carolyn
Carney	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Carson (IN)	Graham	Matsui
Cartwright	Grayson	McCollum
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	McDermott
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McGovern
Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez	Meng
Ciçilline	Hahn	Moore
Clark (MA)	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Neal
Clay	Himes	Nolan
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Norcross
Cohen	Honda	O'Rourke
Connolly	Huffman	Pallone
Conyers	Israel	Pascrell
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Payne
Crowley	Jeffries	Pelosi
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pocan
DeGette	Keating	Polis
Delaney	Kennedy	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Kildee	Quigley
DelBene	Kilmer	Rangel
DeSaulnier	Kuster	Reichert
Deutch	Langevin	Rice (NY)
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Richmond

Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speler  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Amodai  
Barletta  
Becerra  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Carter (TX)  
Clayburn  
Cook  
Cooper  
Cummings  
Diaz-Balart  
Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Green, Gene  
Hastings  
Herrera Beutler  
Hoyer  
Kelly (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Larson (CT)  
Lewis  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Murphy (FL)  
Napolitano  
Pompeo  
Roby  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sessions  
Smith (WA)  
Stivers  
Westmoreland

Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speler  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rogers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stutzman  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stutzman  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOT VOTING—32

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1154

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 169, noes 236,  
not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—169

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Poster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Nadler  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Neal  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger

NOES—236

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Babin  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rogers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOT VOTING—28

Amodai  
Barletta  
Becerra  
Bost  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield

Carter (TX) Hastings Pompeo  
 Clyburn Herrera Beutler Roby  
 Cook Hoyer Sanchez, Loretta  
 Cooper Kelly (IL) Sessions  
 Diaz-Balart Kirkpatrick Smith (WA)  
 Fattah Meeks Westmoreland  
 Fitzpatrick Murphy (FL)  
 Green, Gene Napolitano

Meehan Ribble Thompson (PA)  
 Messer Rice (SC) Thornberry  
 Mica Rigell Tiberi  
 Miller (FL) Roe (TN) Tipton  
 Kirkpatrick Rogers (KY) Trott  
 Smith (MI) Rohrabacher Turner  
 Moolenaar Rokita Upton  
 Mooney (WV) Rooney (FL) Valadao  
 Mullin Ros-Lehtinen Wagner  
 Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Roskam  
 Neugebauer Ross Walberg  
 Newhouse Rothfus Walden  
 Noem Rouzer Walker  
 Nugent Royce Walorski  
 Nunes Russell Walters, Mimi  
 Olson Salmon Weber (TX)  
 Palazzo Sanford Webster (FL)  
 Palmer Scalise Wenstrup  
 Paulsen Schweikert Westerman  
 Pearce Scott, Austin Whitfield  
 Perry Sensenbrenner Williams  
 Peterson Shimkus Wilson (SC)  
 Pittenger Shuster Wittman  
 Pitts Simpson Womack  
 Poe (TX) Smith (MO) Woodall  
 Poliquin Smith (NE) Yoder  
 Posey Smith (NJ) Yoho  
 Price, Tom Smith (TX) Young (AK)  
 Ratcliffe Stefanik Young (IA)  
 Reed Stewart Young (IN)  
 Reichert Stivers Zeldin  
 Renacci Stutzman Zinke

Fattah Kirkpatrick Rogers (AL)  
 Fitzpatrick Lummis Sanchez, Loretta  
 Green, Gene Meeks Sessions  
 Hastings Murphy (FL) Smith (WA)  
 Herrera Beutler Napolitano Westmoreland  
 Hoyer Pompeo  
 Kelly (IL) Roby

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1158

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”  
 So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1201  
 Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”  
 So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

RECORDED VOTE  
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 173, not voting 28, as follows:

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 165, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—232

AYES—239

Abraham Dent Huizenga (MI)  
 Aderholt DeSantis Hultgren  
 Allen DesJarlais Hunter  
 Babin Donovan Hurd (TX)  
 Barr Duffy Hurd (VA)  
 Barton Duncan (SC) Issa  
 Benishek Duncan (TN) Jenkins (KS)  
 Bilirakis Ellmers (NC) Jenkins (WV)  
 Bishop (GA) Emmer (MN) Johnson (OH)  
 Bishop (MI) Farenthold Johnson, Sam  
 Bishop (UT) Fincher Jolly  
 Black Fleischmann Jones  
 Blackburn Fleming Jordan  
 Blum Flores Joyce  
 Bost Forbes Katko  
 Boustany Fortenberry Kelly (MS)  
 Brady (TX) Foxx Kelly (PA)  
 Brat Franks (AZ) King (IA)  
 Bridenstine Frelinghuysen King (NY)  
 Brooks (AL) Garrett Kinzinger (IL)  
 Brooks (IN) Gibbs Kline  
 Buchanan Gibson Knight  
 Buck Gohmert Labrador  
 Bucshon Goodlatte LaHood  
 Burgess Gosar LaMalfa  
 Byrne Gowdy Lamborn  
 Calvert Granger Lance  
 Carter (GA) Graves (GA) Latta  
 Carter (TX) Graves (LA) LoBiondo  
 Chabot Graves (MO) Long  
 Chaffetz Griffith Loudermilk  
 Clawson (FL) Grothman Love  
 Coffman Guinta Lucas  
 Cole Guthrie Luetkemeyer  
 Collins (GA) Hanna Marchant  
 Collins (NY) Hardy Marino  
 Comstock Harper Massie  
 Conaway Harris McCarthy  
 Costello (PA) Hartzler McCaul  
 Cramer Heck (NV) McClintock  
 Crawford Hensarling McHenry  
 Crenshaw Hice, Jody B. McKinley  
 Culberson Hill McMorris  
 Curbelo (FL) Holding Rodgers  
 Davis, Rodney Hudson McSally  
 Denham Huelskamp Meadows

Adams Fudge Nolan  
 Aguilar Gabbard Norcross  
 Amash Gallego O'Rourke  
 Ashford Garamendi Pallone  
 Bass Graham Pascrell  
 Beatty Grayson Payne  
 Bera Green, Al Pelosi  
 Beyer Grijalva Perlmutter  
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Peters  
 Bonamici Hahn Pingree  
 Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA)  
 F. Higgins  
 Brady (PA) Himes  
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa  
 Bustos Honda  
 Capps Huffman  
 Capuano Israel  
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee  
 Carney Jeffries  
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)  
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B.  
 Castor (FL) Kaptur  
 Castro (TX) Keating  
 Chu, Judy Kennedy  
 Cicilline Kildee  
 Clark (MA) Kilmer  
 Clarke (NY) Kind  
 Clay Kuster  
 Cleaver Langevin  
 Cohen Larsen (WA)  
 Connolly Larson (CT)  
 Conyers Lawrence  
 Costa Lee  
 Courtney Levin  
 Crowley Lewis  
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted  
 Cummings Lipinski  
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack  
 Davis, Danny Lofgren  
 DeFazio Lowenthal  
 DeGette Lowey  
 Delaney Lujan Grisham  
 DeLauro (NM) Titus  
 DeBene Luján, Ben Ray  
 DeSaulnier (NM) Torres  
 Lynch Tsongas  
 Dingell MacArthur Van Hollen  
 Doggett Maloney Vargas  
 Dold Carolyn Veasey  
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean  
 F. Matsui  
 Duckworth McCollum  
 Edwards McDermott  
 Ellison McGovern  
 Engel McNeerney  
 Eshoo Meng  
 Esty Moore  
 Farr Moulton  
 Foster Nadler  
 Frankel (FL) Neal

Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

Abraham Denham Hultgren  
 Aderholt Dent Hunter  
 Allen DeSantis Hurd (TX)  
 Amash DesJarlais Hurd (VA)  
 Ashford Duffy Issa  
 Babin Duncan (SC) Jenkins (KS)  
 Barr Duncan (TN) Jenkins (WV)  
 Barton Ellmers (NC) Johnson (OH)  
 Benishek Emmer (MN) Johnson, Sam  
 Bilirakis Farenthold Jolly  
 Bishop (GA) Fincher Jones  
 Bishop (MI) Fleischmann Jordan  
 Bishop (UT) Fleming Joyce  
 Black Flores Katko  
 Blackburn Forbes Kelly (MS)  
 Blum Fortenberry Kelly (PA)  
 Bost Foxx  
 Boustany Franks (AZ) King (IA)  
 Brady (TX) Frelinghuysen Kinzinger (IL)  
 Brat Garrett Kline  
 Bridenstine Gibbs Knight  
 Brooks (AL) Gibson Labrador  
 Brooks (IN) Gohmert LaHood  
 Buchanan Goodlatte LaMalfa  
 Buck Gosar Lamborn  
 Bucshon Gowdy Lance  
 Burgess Graham Latta  
 Byrne Granger LoBiondo  
 Calvert Graves (GA) Long  
 Carter (GA) Graves (LA) Loudermilk  
 Carter (TX) Graves (MO) Love  
 Chabot Griffith Lucas  
 Chaffetz Grothman Luetkemeyer  
 Clawson (FL) Guinta MacArthur  
 Coffman Guthrie Marchant  
 Cole Hanna Marino  
 Collins (GA) Hardy Massie  
 Collins (NY) Harper McCarthy  
 Comstock Harris McCaul  
 Conaway Hartzler McClintock  
 Costello (PA) Heck (NV) McHenry  
 Cramer Hensarling McKinley  
 Crawford Hice, Jody B. McMorris  
 Crenshaw Hill Rodgers  
 Culberson Cuellar Holding McSally  
 Curbelo (FL) Culberson Hudson Meadows  
 Davis, Rodney Curbelo (FL) Huelskamp Meehan  
 Denham Huizenga (MI) Messer

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei Brown (FL)  
 Barletta Butterfield  
 Becerra Clyburn

Cook  
 Cooper  
 Diaz-Balart



Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)

Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman

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

NOES—165

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
King (NY)  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nolan

Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—29

Amodei  
Barletta  
Becerra  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield

Clyburn  
Cook  
Cooper  
Davis, Rodney  
Diaz-Balart

Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Green, Gene  
Hastings  
Hastings  
Herrera Beutler

Hoyer  
Kelly (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Lummis  
Meeks

Murphy (FL)  
Napolitano  
Pompeo  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)

Sanchez, Loretta  
Sessions  
Smith (WA)  
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1204

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. RIBBLE  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.  
RIBBLE) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the ayes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 232, noes 171,  
not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—232

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Costa  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce

Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer

Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus

Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner

NOES—171

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meng  
Moore  
Nadler  
Neal  
Norcross

O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—30

Amodei  
Barletta  
Becerra  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Clyburn  
Cook  
Cooper  
Diaz-Balart  
Fattah

Fitzpatrick  
Green, Gene  
Hastings  
Herrera Beutler  
Hoyer  
Kelly (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Smith (WA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Westmoreland  
Young (IN)

Pompeo  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rokita  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sessions  
Smith (WA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Westmoreland  
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1207

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 97, there was an error in the transaction of my electronic vote. My office and the Clerk are looking into the matter. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 169, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

AYES—236

Abraham	Dent	Hurd (TX)
Aderholt	DeSantis	Hurt (VA)
Allen	DesJarlais	Issa
Amash	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Ashford	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Benishek	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Jordan
Bishop (GA)	Fincher	Joyce
Bishop (MI)	Fleischmann	Katko
Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Kelly (MS)
Black	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Blackburn	Forbes	King (IA)
Blum	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Bost	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Brat	Garrett	Labrador
Bridenstine	Gibbs	LaHood
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	LaMalfa
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Lance
Buck	Gosar	Latta
Bucshon	Gowdy	LoBiondo
Burgess	Granger	Long
Byrne	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Love
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Chabot	Grothman	Lummis
Chaffetz	Guinta	MacArthur
Clawson (FL)	Guthrie	Marchant
Coffman	Hanna	Marino
Cole	Hardy	Massie
Collins (GA)	Harper	McCarthy
Collins (NY)	Harris	McCauley
Comstock	Hartzler	McClintock
Conaway	Heck (NV)	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	McKinley
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Crawford	Hill	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Holding	McSally
Cuellar	Hudson	Meadows
Culberson	Huelskamp	Meehan
Curbeo (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Messer
Davis, Rodney	Hultgren	Mica
Denham	Hunter	Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)
Moolenaar	Rogers (KY)
Mooney (WV)	Rohrabacher
Mullin	Rokita
Mulvaney	Rooney (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Neugebauer	Roskam
Newhouse	Ross
Noem	Rothfus
Nugent	Rouzer
Nunes	Royce
Olson	Russell
Palazzo	Salmon
Palmer	Sanford
Paulsen	Scalise
Pearce	Schrader
Perry	Schweikert
Peterson	Scott, Austin
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner
Pitts	Shimkus
Poe (TX)	Shuster
Poliquin	Simpson
Posey	Smith (MO)
Price, Tom	Smith (NE)
Ratcliffe	Smith (NJ)
Reed	Smith (TX)
Renacci	Stefanik
Ribble	Stewart
Rice (SC)	Stivers
Rigell	Stutzman

NOES—169

Adams	Garamendi
Aguilar	Graham
Bass	Grayson
Beatty	Green, Al
Bera	Grijalva
Beyer	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hahn
Bonamici	Heck (WA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa
Bustos	Honda
Capps	Huffman
Capuano	Israel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee
Carney	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Keating
Chu, Judy	Kennedy
Cicilline	Kildee
Clark (MA)	Kilmer
Clarke (NY)	Kind
Cleaver	Kuster
Cohen	Langevin
Connolly	Larsen (WA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)
Costa	Lawrence
Courtney	Lee
Crowley	Levin
Cummings	Lewis
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted
Davis, Danny	Lipinski
DeFazio	Loeb sack
DeGette	Lofgren
Delaney	Lowenthal
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham (NM)
DelBene	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
DeSaulnier	Lynch
Deutch	Maloney, Carolyn
Dingell	Maloney, Sean
Doggett	Matsui
Dold	McCollum
Doyle, Michael F.	McDermott
Duckworth	McGovern
Ellison	McNerney
Engel	Meng
Esty	Moore
Eshoo	Moulton
Hanna	Nadler
Hardy	Neal
Harper	Nolan
Harris	Norcross
Hartzler	O'Rourke
Heck (NV)	
McHenry	
McKinley	
McMorris	
Rodgers	
McSally	
Meadows	
Meehan	
Messer	
Mica	
Miller (FL)	

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Cook
Barletta	Cooper
Becerra	Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL)	Edwards
Butterfield	Fattah
Clyburn	Fitzpatrick

Thompson (PA)	Meeks
Thornberry	Murphy (FL)
Tiberi	Napolitano
Tipton	Pompeo
Trott	
Turner	
Upton	
Valadao	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walker	
Walorski	
Walters, Mimi	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Wenstrup	
Westerman	
Williams	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Yoho	
Young (AK)	
Young (IA)	
Young (IN)	
Zeldin	
Zinke	

Meeks	Roby	Smith (WA)
Murphy (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	
Pompeo	Sessions	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1210

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 227, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—176

Adams	Esty	Maloney,
Aguilar	Farr	Carolyn
Ashford	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Beatty	Fudge	McCollum
Bera	Gabbard	McDermott
Beyer	Gallego	McGovern
Blumenauer	Garamendi	McNerney
Bonamici	Gibson	Meng
Boyle, Brendan F.	Graham	Moore
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Nadler
Bustos	Grijalva	Neal
Capps	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Capuano	Hahn	Norcross
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Carney	Higgins	Pallone
Carson (IN)	Himes	Pascarell
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Paulsen
Castor (FL)	Honda	Payne
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Pelosi
Chu, Judy	Hurt (VA)	Perlmutter
Cicilline	Israel	Peters
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	Pocan
Clawson (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Quigley
Cohen	Keating	Rangel
Connolly	Kennedy	Reichert
Conyers	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kilmer	Richmond
Crowley	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kuster	Royce
Cummings	Langevin	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Delaney	Levin	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lewis	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Schrader
Deutch	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb sack	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Dold	Lowenthal	Sherman
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowey	Sinema
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sires
Ellison	McCollum	Slaughter
Engel	McDermott	Smith (NJ)
Eshoo	McGovern	Smith (NY)
Hanna	McNerney	Speier
Hardy	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Harper	Moore	
Harris	Moulton	
Hartzler	Nadler	
Heck (NV)	Neal	
McHenry	Nolan	
McKinley	Norcross	
McMorris	O'Rourke	
Rodgers		
McSally		
Meadows		
Meehan		
Messer		
Mica		
Miller (FL)		

Takai	Van Hollen	Wasserman
Takano	Vargas	Schultz
Thompson (CA)	Veasey	Waters, Maxine
Thompson (MS)	Vela	Watson Coleman
Titus	Velázquez	Welch
Tonko	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Torres	Walz	Yarmuth
Tsongas		

□ 1214

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2406) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 619, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. LAWRENCE. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Lawrence moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2406 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE XVII—PROTECTING WATER SUPPLY FOR PUBLIC RECREATION AND SAFE DRINKING**

**SEC. 1701. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Every year in the United States, an estimated 4,000 tons of lead are lost in ponds and streams as fishing tackle, such as fishing lures and sinkers.

(2) The lead content of fishing tackle has the potential to contaminate water supplies.

**SEC. 1702. PROTECTING WATER SUPPLY FOR PUBLIC RECREATION AND SAFE DRINKING.**

Section 4 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2603) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) PROTECTING WATER SUPPLY FOR PUBLIC RECREATION AND SAFE DRINKING.—Not

later than one year after the date of enactment of this subsection, any manufacturer or processor of an article containing a chemical substance or mixture that has the potential to contaminate water supplies used for public recreation or drinking water provided by a public water system shall generate and provide to all applicable Federal and State agencies responsible for protecting health or the environment data sufficient to understand the risks such article would present to human health and the environment, including studies of the cancer-causing effects, reproductive toxicity, and neurotoxicity of the chemical substance or mixture contained in the article. Exposing the public or the environment to such article without generating such studies shall be considered a prohibited act under this Act.”

Mrs. LAWRENCE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, my amendment will ensure that our public water systems and waterways which are used for public recreation will be protected from an estimated 4,000 tons of lead that are contaminating our ponds and streams from lost fishing tackle.

My amendment will ensure that all manufacturers of products that contain any type of substance with the potential to contaminate our water systems provide to Federal and State agencies the research so we may understand the risks to human health and the environment.

Members of Congress, the manmade water crisis in Flint has shown us the devastating effects of having contaminated water sources. The 100,000 residents of Flint lost a basic human right: access to clean water.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, our drinking water infrastructure has a D grade. That is A, B, C, D. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, \$126 billion will be needed to restore water and wastewater infrastructure over the next 4 years, which leaves a funding gap of \$84 billion.

It is significant to note that the American public overwhelmingly supports investment in our Nation’s water infrastructure, as drinking water is not a luxury. It is a basic need for life.

A poll released just a week ago by the Value of Water Coalition showed that 95 percent of Americans—and that means on both sides of the aisle—believe it is important to invest in water infrastructure.

I regret to say that we in Congress have kicked the can down the road year after year when it comes to investing in our infrastructure.

I know that mayors and Governors and Members of this Congress have sounded the warning sign over and over again about the possibility of a disaster, but we never imagined that it

NOES—227

Abraham	Griffith	Olson
Aderholt	Grothman	Palazzo
Allen	Guinta	Palmer
Amash	Guthrie	Pearce
Babin	Hanna	Perry
Barr	Hardy	Peterson
Barton	Harper	Pittenger
Benishek	Harris	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Posey
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Black	Hill	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hudson	Reed
Blum	Huelskamp	Renacci
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Boustany	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rigell
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Jolly	Roskam
Burgess	Jones	Ross
Byrne	Jordan	Rothfus
Calvert	Joyce	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Katko	Russell
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Scalise
Coffman	King (NY)	Schweikert
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Knight	Shimkus
Comstock	Labrador	Shuster
Conaway	LaHood	Simpson
Costa	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Latta	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Long	Stewart
Culberson	Loudermilk	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Stutzman
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Dent	Lummis	Tiberi
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Trott
Donovan	Marino	Turner
Duffy	Massie	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Walden
Farenthold	McKinley	Walker
Fincher	McMorris	Walorski
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	McSally	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Meehan	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Messer	Westerman
Fox	Mica	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gohmert	Mullin	Woodall
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
Granger	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Noem	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Nugent	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Zinke

NOT VOTING—30

Amodei	Fattah	Murphy (FL)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Napolitano
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pompeo
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Roby
Butterfield	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Clyburn	Holding	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Hoyer	Scott, David
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Meeks	Westmoreland

would come in the form of the mass poisoning of an entire American city.

The children of Flint, the parents, other citizens of Flint, and the citizens of these United States need Congress, not one side of the aisle or the other, to act so that we don't see another generation of children potentially suffer from the negative effects of lead poisoning.

I urge all Members of this 114th Session of the United States Congress to support this motion to recommit on H.R. 2406.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, the minority's motion to recommit is an issue about chemicals in drinking water. Chemicals in drinking water is an issue that was addressed in the Toxic Substances Control Act, which was before this House.

There were multiple opportunities to have a debate about that and to determine what we do to address that issue. That bill passed out of the House. It is now in a preconference committee with the Senate. That was the opportunity.

This bill, the SHARE Act, is a package of commonsense bills that will increase opportunities for hunters, recreational shooters, and anglers; will eliminate unneeded regulatory impediments; will safeguard against new regulations that impede outdoor sporting activities; and will protect Second Amendment rights. It does not pertain to chemicals in drinking water.

Outdoor sporting activities, including hunting, fishing, and recreational shooting, are deeply ingrained in the fabric of America's culture and heritage. Values that are instilled by partaking in these activities are passed down from generation to generation and play a significant part in the lives of millions of Americans.

This important legislation will sustain America's rich hunting and fishing traditions, will improve access to our public lands for responsible outdoor sporting activities, and will help to ensure that the current and future generations of sportsmen and -women are able to enjoy the sporting activities this country holds dear.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation and to defeat the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 165, nays 238, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—165

Adams	Gabbard	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Gallego	Pallone
Ashford	Garamendi	Pascarell
Bass	Graham	Payne
Beatty	Grayson	Pelosi
Bera	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Beyer	Grijalva	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pingree
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins	Polis
F.	Himes	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Honda	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Rangel
Bustos	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capuano	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kildee	T.
Chu, Judy	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Lawrence	Sherman
Connolly	Lee	Sinema
Conyers	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Cuellar	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Loeb sack	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe y	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Delaney	(NM)	Tonko
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
DelBene	(NM)	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Van Hollen
Deutch	Maloney,	Vargas
Dingell	Carolyn	Veasey
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Doyle, Michael	Matsui	Velázquez
F.	McCollum	Visclosky
Duckworth	McDermott	Wasserman
Ellison	McGovern	Schultz
Engel	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Eshoo	Moore	Watson Coleman
Esty	Moulton	Welch
Farr	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Neal	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Nolan	
Fudge	Norcross	

NAYS—238

Abraham	Burgess	DeSantis
Aderholt	Byrne	DesJarlais
Allen	Calvert	Dold
Amash	Carter (GA)	Donovan
Babin	Carter (TX)	Duffy
Barr	Chabot	Duncan (SC)
Barton	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Ellmers (NC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Emmer (MN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Farenthold
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Black	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Blackburn	Comstock	Fleming
Blum	Conaway	Flores
Bost	Costa	Forbes
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Fox
Brat	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
Buck	Denham	Gohmert
Bucshon	Dent	Goodlatte

Gosar	Lummis	Ross
Gowdy	MacArthur	Rothfus
Granger	Marchant	Rouzer
Graves (GA)	Marino	Royce
Graves (LA)	Massie	Russell
Graves (MO)	McCarthy	Salmon
Griffith	McCauley	Sanford
Grothman	McClintock	Scalise
Guinta	McHenry	Schrader
Guthrie	McKinley	Schweikert
Hanna	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Hardy	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner
Harper	McNerney	Shimkus
Harris	McSally	Shuster
Hartzler	Meadows	Simpson
Heck (NV)	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Hensarling	Messer	Smith (NE)
Hice, Jody B.	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hill	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Stefanik
Hudson	Moolenaar	Stewart
Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)	Stivers
Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Stutzman
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Hurd (TX)	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Hurt (VA)	Newhouse	Tipton
Issa	Noem	Trott
Jenkins (KS)	Nugent	Turner
Jenkins (OH)	Nunes	Upton
Johnson (WV)	Olson	Valadao
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Wagner
Jolly	Palmer	Walberg
Jones	Paulsen	Walden
Jordan	Pearce	Walker
Joyce	Perry	Walorski
Katko	Pittenger	Walters, Mimi
Kelly (MS)	Pitts	Walz
Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
King (IA)	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
King (NY)	Posey	Wenstrup
Kinzinger (IL)	Price, Tom	Westerman
Kline	Ratcliffe	Whitfield
Knight	Reed	Williams
Labrador	Reichert	Wilson (SC)
LaHood	Renacci	Wittman
LaMalfa	Ribble	Womack
Lamborn	Rice (SC)	Woodall
Lance	Rigell	Yoder
Latta	Roe (TN)	Yoho
LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Long	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)
Loudermilk	Rokita	Young (IN)
Love	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin
Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen	Zinke
Luetkemeyer	Roskam	

NOT VOTING—30

Amodei	Fattah	Murphy (FL)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Napolitano
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pompeo
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Roby
Butterfield	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta
Cook	Hoyer	Scott, David
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Meeks	Westmoreland

□ 1229

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 161, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—242

Abraham	Allen	Ashford
Aderholt	Amash	Babin

Barr  
Barton  
Benishkek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie

NOES—161

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brownley (CA)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright

Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vela  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
King (NY)  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren

NOT VOTING—30

Amodei  
Barletta  
Becerra  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Clyburn  
Cook  
Cooper  
Diaz-Balart  
Edwards  
Fattah  
Fitzpatrick  
Green, Gene  
Hastings  
Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Hoyer  
Kelly (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Meeks  
Murphy (FL)  
Napolitano  
Pompeo  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Scott, David  
Sessions  
Smith (WA)  
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. STEFANIK) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1235

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, February 23; Wednesday, February 24; Thursday, February 25; and Friday, February 26, 2016, I was on medical leave while recovering from hip replacement surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 83 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4408, as amended).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 84 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4402, as amended).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 85 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 618).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 88 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 618).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 87 (on agreeing to the Cartwright Amendment to H.R. 3624).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 88 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 3624, with instructions).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 89 (on passage of H.R. 3624).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 90 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 619).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 91 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 619).

“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 92 (on agreeing to the Beyer Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 93 (on agreeing to the Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 94 (on agreeing to the Beyer Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 95 (on agreeing to the Smith of Missouri Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 96 (on agreeing to the Griffith Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 97 (on agreeing to the Ribble Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 98 (on agreeing to the Young of Alaska Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 99 (on agreeing to the Huffman Amendment to H.R. 2406).  
“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 100 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 2406, with instructions).  
“No” on rollcall vote No. 101 (on passage of H.R. 2406).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, on February 26, 2016, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:  
On rollcall No. 92, 93, 94, 99, and 100, I would have voted “no.”  
On rollcall No. 95, 96, 97, 98, and 101, I would have voted “yes.”

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2406, SPORTSMEN’S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 2406, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to accurately reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?  
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 3716, ENSURING TERMINATED PROVIDERS ARE REMOVED FROM MEDICAID AND CHIP ACT, AND H.R. 4557, BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2016

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)  
Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, this week the Rules Committee issued two announcements outlining the amendment processes for H.R. 3716, Ensuring Terminated Providers are Removed From Medicaid and CHIP Act, and H.R. 4557, Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016.  
The amendment deadline for H.R. 3716 has been set for Monday, February 29, at noon. The amendment deadline for H.R. 4557 has been set for 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 1.