concerning to me, and I think it's something we ought to discuss.

This bill has been changed—I think significantly—since it left the committee on November 18. An amendment was added at 12:58—that is the date on it, today. Admittedly, we knew about it maybe an hour before that, but an amendment that changes this bill significantly was added today. That is not the process you go through. Once again, poor process will equate to poor public policy.

The amendment that was added in here took out salvaged sales on BLM land. That is not what was in the bill when it went through committee, and I would suggest that I am not in favor of that change to a very good bill. We will be told, I'm assuming, that this change was made to conform what practices we do on BLM with national forest land. However, what we are doing is changing the law to conform to an agency regulation, which is, indeed, backwards.

Congress should be establishing what our requirements are and what our practices are, not forcing Congress to try to regulate ourselves and relate ourselves to what an agency of government, through its own internal regulations, does. So I am opposed to this amendment, which was added within the very last 2 hours. That should not be there and was not discussed in committee.

I am also opposed in one particular way to the concept that this was made from a ''shall'' to a ''may.'' I would like it very much more had it been with the original language that Representative DEFAZIO proposed in making this a ''shall'' issue as opposed to simply making this or any other bill that comes before us today into a ''may,'' to make it at the whim of the Secretary.

Now, with those two conclusions, I will say that this is still a good bill. This is still a bill that I think should go forward. This is a bill that should have gone forward in the way it came out of committee, in which it was a stronger and better bill, and I will still vote on it on the floor. But I am perplexed with these changes that have been made that weaken this bill and do not improve it and, more importantly, with the process we are going through to make these last-minute changes when they should have been done with full committee hearing, with full committee discussion, and full committee markup.

In closing, let me just apologize for making a misstatement in the first place. I am told now that there is a statute that since has been done by the National Forest Service, so the statutes are consistent. They are consistently wrong, but they are still consistent here. It is still the wrong thing to do, and those salvaged sales should have been approved on both BLM as well as national forest land, and I still resent the process that went through, even though what I said was technically wrong earlier.

With that, I intend to vote ''yes'' because I think the DeFazio bill is a good bill. It needs to go forward. It is the right thing to do, but we could have done a whole lot better if we had really put our minds to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3759, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant market-related contract extensions of certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 725) to protect Indian arts and crafts through the improvement of applicable criminal proceedings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 725

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 ''Indian Arts and Crafts Amendments Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS.

(a) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS; CIVIL ACTIONS; MISREPRESENTATIONS.—Section 5 of the Act entitled ''An Act to promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes'' (25 U.S.C. 305d) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 5. CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS; CIVIL ACTIONS.

''(a) DEFINITION OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—In this section, the term 'Federal law enforcement officer' includes a Federal law enforcement officer (as defined in section 115(c) of title 18, United States Code).

''(b) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS.—Any Federal law enforcement officer shall have the authority to conduct an investigation relating to an alleged violation of this Act occurring within the jurisdiction of the United States.

''(c) CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) INVESTIGATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board may refer an alleged violation of section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, to any Federal law enforcement officer for appropriate investigation.

''(B) REFERRAL NOT REQUIRED.—A Federal law enforcement officer may investigate an alleged violation of section 1159 of that title regardless of whether the Federal law enforcement officer receives a referral under subparagraph (A).

''(2) FINDINGS.—The findings of an investigation of an alleged violation of section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, by any Federal department or agency under paragraph (1)(A) shall be submitted, as appropriate, to—

''(A) a Federal or State prosecuting authority; or

''(B) the Board.

''(3) RECOMMENDATIONS.—On receiving the findings of an investigation under paragraph (2), the Board may—

''(A) recommend to the Attorney General that criminal proceedings be initiated under section 1159 of title 18, United States Code; and

''(B) provide such support to the Attorney General relating to the criminal proceedings as the Attorney General determines to be appropriate.

''(d) CIVIL ACTIONS.—In lieu of, or in addition to, any criminal proceeding under subsection (c), the Board may recommend that the Attorney General initiate a civil action under section 6.''.

(b) CAUSE OF ACTION FOR MISREPRESENTATION.—Section 6 of the Act entitled ''An Act to promote the development of Indian arts and crafts and to create a board to assist therein, and for other purposes'' (25 U.S.C. 305e) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (c) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively;

(3) by inserting before subsection (b) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) the following:

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' means an individual that—

''(A) is a member of an Indian tribe; or

''(B) is certified as an Indian artisan by an Indian tribe.

''(2) INDIAN PRODUCT.—The term 'Indian product' has the meaning given the term in any regulation promulgated by the Secretary.

''(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

''(B) INCLUSION.—The term 'Indian tribe' includes, for purposes of this section only, an Indian group that has been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by—

''(i) a State legislature;

''(ii) a State commission; or

''(iii) another similar organization vested with State legislative tribal recognition authority.

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

(4) in subsection (b) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)'';

(5) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (2))—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(B) by striking ''suit'' and inserting ''the civil action'';

(6) by striking subsection (d) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)) and inserting the following:

''(d) PERSONS THAT MAY INITIATE CIVIL ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A civil action under subsection (b) may be initiated by—

''(A) the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary acting on behalf of—

''(i) an Indian tribe;

''(ii) an Indian; or

''(iii) an Indian arts and crafts organization;

''(B) an Indian tribe, acting on behalf of—

''(i) the Indian tribe;

''(ii) a member of that Indian tribe; or

''(iii) an Indian arts and crafts organization;

''(C) an Indian; or

''(D) an Indian arts and crafts organization.

''(2) DISPOSITION OF AMOUNTS RECOVERED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an amount recovered in a civil action under this section shall be paid to the Indian tribe, the Indian, or the Indian arts and crafts organization on the behalf of which the civil action was initiated.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In the case of a civil action initiated under paragraph (1)(A), the Attorney General may deduct from the amount—

''(I) the amount of the cost of the civil action and reasonable attorney's fees awarded under subsection (c), to be deposited in the Treasury and credited to appropriations available to the Attorney General on the date on which the amount is recovered; and

''(II) the amount of the costs of investigation awarded under subsection (c), to reimburse the Board for the activities of the Board relating to the civil action.

''(ii) INDIAN TRIBE.—In the case of a civil action initiated under paragraph (1)(B), the Indian tribe may deduct from the amount—

''(I) the amount of the cost of the civil action; and

''(II) reasonable attorney's fees.''; and

(7) in subsection (e), by striking ''(e) In the event that'' and inserting the following:

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISION.—If''.

SEC. 3. MISREPRESENTATION OF INDIAN PRODUCED GOODS AND PRODUCTS.

Section 1159 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

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

''(b) PENALTY.—Any person that knowingly violates subsection (a) shall—

''(1) in the case of a first violation by that person—

''(A) if the applicable goods are offered or displayed for sale at a total price of $1,000 or more, or if the applicable goods are sold for a total price of $1,000 or more—

''(i) in the case of an individual, be fined not more than $250,000, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $1,000,000; and

''(B) if the applicable goods are offered or displayed for sale at a total price of less than $1,000, or if the applicable goods are sold for a total price of less than $1,000—

''(i) in the case of an individual, be fined not more than $25,000, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both; and

''(ii) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $100,000; and

''(2) in the case of a subsequent violation by that person, regardless of the amount for which any good is offered or displayed for sale or sold—

''(A) in the case of an individual, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both; and

''(B) in the case of a person other than an individual, be fined not more than $5,000,000.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) the term 'Indian tribe'—

''(A) has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b); and

''(B) includes, for purposes of this section only, an Indian group that has been formally recognized as an Indian tribe by—

''(i) a State legislature;

''(ii) a State commission; or

''(iii) another similar organization vested with State legislative tribal recognition authority; and''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. 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 under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Natural Resources Committee chairman, Mr. NICK RAHALL, and myself, I would like to commend the gentleman from Arizona, Representative ED PASTOR, for sponsoring the pending measure and for working with the committee to bring it before the full House.

The sale of misrepresented and counterfeit American Indian jewelry, pottery, baskets, rugs, and other items cheats the consumer, degrades the entire native market, and robs talented, hardworking native artisans of their living. This has been a growing problem that Mr. PASTOR's legislation will effectively address.

H.R. 725 would amend the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 to authorize any Federal law enforcement officer to conduct an investigation of an offense involving the sale of any good that is represented as an Indian-produced good. The legislation also requires that the findings of an investigation of an alleged offense be submitted to a Federal or State prosecuting authority or to the Indian Arts and Crafts Board.

Again, I want to commend my colleague Mr. PASTOR of Arizona for his hard work and dedication to this piece of legislation. He is addressing a longstanding problem with this bill, and I ask my colleagues to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I rise to slowly yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have no objections to H.R. 725, and indeed, we support appropriate law enforcement efforts to stop illegal counterfeiting of Indian arts and crafts. However, I would like to note a concern for the record, because this bill could have been written in a way to increase its effectiveness.

At the committee hearing on H.R. 725, it became clear that the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Office of Law Enforcement is contemplated to be the primary agency to investigate and enforce any violations of this new Indian Arts and Crafts Act. As written, this bill, H.R. 725, authorizes any Federal law enforcement officer to enforce the act. That is the issue. It authorizes any Federal law enforcement officer to authorize the act. This would include law enforcement officers who may or may not have expertise in dealing with tribes, with artists, counterfeit art or crafts.

So I certainly hope that the President takes appropriate steps to delegate this overly broad law enforcement authority only to the agency or the agencies that have the funding, manpower, time, and expertise to enforce this important but somewhat complex area of law. It would be nice if Congress were to actually take that responsibility to ourselves. Indeed, the very goal of stopping this illegally counterfeited Indian art should not be turned over to law enforcement agencies who are strained with other duties, other kinds of investigation of crime, acts of terrorism, fraud, or any other kind of scheme that takes place.

Finally, in addition to the fact that this has not been specified where it should be, I do want to note that there is a largely identical bill, sponsored by the Senator from Arizona, that is in the House. If we had taken up that bill today, it could probably be signed into law this particular week. I have no idea why we did not take up the Senate bill rather than pushing this bill forward, and for whatever reason it is. If, indeed, it is simply because it's a Senator's bill, that may be good enough for me. But if there are other concepts that may be there, there are still questions as to why we are not passing Senate Bill 151 rather than this one. However, by passing H.R. 725 today, we are simply delaying the enactment of this particular bill.

So once again, I think we missed the opportunity of trying to narrow in our particular focus on the enforcement powers, and there are still some questions on why this bill is taking precedence over others that may speed up the actual date of enactment of this, but with the substance of the bill, I am in support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In 1935, Congress enacted legislation to establish the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. The Indian Arts and Crafts Board, an agency within the U.S. Department of the Interior, is responsible for promoting the development of American Indian and Alaska Native arts and crafts, improving the economic status of the members of the Indian tribes, and helping to develop and expand marketing opportunities for arts and crafts produced by the American Indians and Alaska Natives.

The 1935 legislation adopted criminal penalties for selling goods with the

misrepresentation that they were Indian produced. This provision, currently located in section 1159 of title 18, U.S. Code, set fines not to exceed $500 or imprisonment not to exceed 6 months or both. Although this law was in effect for many years, it provided no meaningful deterrent to those who misrepresented imitation arts and crafts as Indian produced. In addition, willful intent was required to be proved. Therefore, very little enforcement took place.

So H.R. 725 seeks to address this continuing problem by strengthening the penalties associated with misrepresentation of Indian-produced goods and by empowering Federal, tribal, and local authorities to undertake investigations and enforcement. A Senate companion bill, S. 151, passed the Senate on July 24, 2009.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very complete and thorough analysis that the gentlelady from Guam did on this particular bill. It was well done.

I will ask at this time if the gentlelady from Guam has any more speakers for this particular bill.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any additional speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Sadly, neither do I. So at this time, I will simply go forward and say that we still support it. We still think this bill could have been done better. We are still very curious on why the Senate bill was not being pushed forward, but we support the purpose and the goals of this particular piece of legislation, and we will be very happy to support it here on the floor as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I again urge Members to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 725, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3538) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3538

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 ''Idaho Wilderness Water Facilities Act''.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXISTING WATER DIVERSIONS IN FRANK CHURCH-RIVER OF NO RETURN WILDERNESS AND SELWAY-BITTERROOT WILDERNESS, IDAHO.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR CONTINUED USE.—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue a special use authorization to each of the 20 owners of a water storage, transport, or diversion facility (in this section referred to as a ''facility'') located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness or the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness (as identified on the map titled ''Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness'', dated December 14, 2009, or the map titled ''Unauthorized Private Water Diversions located within the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness'', dated December 11, 2009) for the continued operation, maintenance, and reconstruction of the facility if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the facility was in existence on the date on which the land upon which the facility is located was designated as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (in this section referred to as ''the date of designation'');

(2) the facility has been in substantially continuous use to deliver water for the beneficial use on the owner's non-Federal land since the date of designation;

(3) the owner of the facility holds a valid water right for use of the water on the owner's non-Federal land under Idaho State law, with a priority date that predates the date of designation; and

(4) it is not practicable or feasible to relocate the facility to land outside of the wilderness and continue the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land recognized under State law.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) EQUIPMENT, TRANSPORT, AND USE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) allow use of motorized equipment and mechanized transport for operation, maintenance, or reconstruction of a facility, if the Secretary determines that—

(i) the use is necessary to allow the facility to continue delivery of water to the non-Federal land for the beneficial uses recognized by the water right held under Idaho State law; and

(ii) after conducting a minimum tool analysis for the facility, the use of nonmotorized equipment and nonmechanized transport is impracticable or infeasible; and

(B) preclude use of the facility for the storage, diversion, or transport of water in excess of the water right recognized by the State of Idaho on the date of designation.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In a special use authorization issued under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to—

(A) require or allow modification or relocation of the facility in the wilderness, as the Secretary determines necessary, to reduce impacts to wilderness values set forth in section 2 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) if the beneficial use of water on the non-Federal land is not diminished; and

(B) require that the owner provide a reciprocal right of access across the non-Federal property, in which case, the owner shall receive market value for any right-of-way or other interest in real property conveyed to the United States, and market value may be paid by the Secretary, in whole or in part, by the grant of a reciprocal right-of-way, or by reduction of fees or other costs that may accrue to the owner to obtain the authorization for water facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman in Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. 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 under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, prior to the designation of the Frank Church-River of No Return and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness areas in Idaho, private landowners received permits to maintain and repair water diversions on national forest land now included in those wilderness areas. Many of those permits have since expired, leaving those who own the water diversions without options for mechanically maintaining their water systems.

The bill before us, H.R. 3538, would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to issue special use authorizations to owners of specific water storage, transport, or diversion facilities within these wilderness areas. The permits would only be issued if the owner can prove that the water facility meets certain criteria specified in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we support the passage of H.R. 3538, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill, as introduced by Mr. SIMPSON of Idaho, would require the Forest Service to issue special use permits to owners of small, existing water systems in two Idaho wilderness areas. And although these water diversions continue to operate, their owners currently lack the authority to maintain or repair these facilities. Failure to maintain or repair these facilities would harm not only the farms and ranches that need to be assured of having access to water that they own to be viable, but also will be important for the Forest Service to maintain the environmental needs and watersheds on these particular Forest Service lands.

This bill, H.R. 3538, will allow the owners of the existing water systems to do this necessary maintenance.

Let me just say this legislation has been very narrowly tailored to apply to