

Interior, for only up to 25 years. Any nongrazing lease could be renewed up to one additional term of 25 years for a total of 50 years.

The restriction on the length of time a Tribe can lease their land can have a negative impact on a Tribe's ability to negotiate long-term commercial leases and, subsequently, a Tribe's economic development opportunities.

Congress has amended the Long-Term Leasing Act more than 50 times to adjust the terms and conditions of leases of Tribal lands and authorize specific Tribes or Tribal lands to lease for a term of up to 99 years, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

This legislation would put a stop to Tribes having to rely on Congress to pass specific legislation so that they can enter into long-term leases should they choose to do so.

H.R. 1246 would proactively extend leasing authority to all federally recognized Tribes while providing a more expedited path forward for economic development. This is commonsense legislation that will benefit Tribes long into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage adoption of the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1246, which would amend the Long-Term Leasing Act to authorize federally recognized Tribes to enter into lease agreements on their lands for periods of up to 99 years.

As noted, currently under the Long-Term Leasing Act, Tribes are generally limited to lease agreement terms that are no more than 25 years with an option to renew for an additional 25 years. This has led so many Tribes to enter into very complex leasing agreements of 25 plus 25 when all of that puts a constraint on the economic development opportunities that Tribes must be taking advantage of and that they want to take advantage of.

As you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, these limits are challenging, and they are not needed.

For that reason, though, historically, Congress has passed noncontroversial bills to allow certain Tribes that come before them to have longer leases under the act. We have done this in a piecemeal fashion. In fact, as noted, since the passage of the Long-Term Leasing Act in 1955, some additional 60 Tribes have been added to the growing list of exceptions to the act.

Last Congress, we authorized long-term leasing authority for the Seminole Tribe, and on the floor of the House, I called for legislation to make this applicable to all Tribes so we didn't have to do it one at a time. I am pleased today that, under the leadership of Chair HAGEMAN, we are moving to make that a reality.

Today's bill, H.R. 1246, would strengthen Tribal sovereignty by al-

lowing all federally recognized Tribes to enter into lease agreements for periods up to 99 years, providing Tribes the ability to pursue economic development activities for the benefit of their communities that have been typically limited under the Long-Term Leasing Act.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as noted, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and, in this manner, to support Tribal sovereignty and, once again, bipartisan legislation, which we often see coming out of the Subcommittee on Indian and Insular Affairs. This is the way that we need to encourage to have work coming out of our committees in a bipartisan fashion that increases Tribal sovereignty and that leads us to honor our trust responsibility to our Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would promote economic development for Tribes by ensuring that they are on the same playing field as other landowners who can enter into long-term leases on their land.

This legislation is a proactive step to support Tribes and their ability to create and pursue economic opportunity.

As the chairman of the Indian and Insular Affairs Subcommittee, I do and will continue to advocate for commonsense solutions for our Indian Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of 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 Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1246.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE LAND TRANSFER ACT

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6443) to take certain land in the State of California into trust for the benefit of the Jamul Indian Village of California Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6443

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 "Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. LAND TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR THE JAMUL INDIAN VILLAGE OF CALIFORNIA TRIBE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 172.1 acres of land owned in fee by the Jamul In-

dian Village of California located in San Diego, California, and described in subsection (b) are hereby taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Jamul Indian Village of California.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) PARCEL 1.—Those parcels of land totaling approximately 161.23 acres, located in San Diego County, California, that are held in fee by the Jamul Indian Village of California, as legally described in Document No. 2022-0010260 in the Official Records of the Office of the Recorder, San Diego County, California, and recorded January 7, 2022.

(2) PARCEL 2.—That parcel of land totaling approximately 6 acres, located in San Diego County, California, that is held in fee by the Jamul Indian Village of California, as legally described in Document No. 2021-0540770 in the Official Records of the Office of the Recorder, San Diego County, California, and recorded July 29, 2021.

(3) PARCEL 3.—That parcel of land totaling approximately 4.03 acres, located in San Diego County, California, that is held in fee by the Jamul Indian Village of California, as legally described in Document No. 1998-0020339 in the Official Records of the Office of the Recorder, San Diego County, California, and recorded January 15, 1998.

(4) PARCEL 4.—That parcel of land comprised of approximately 0.84 acres, located in San Diego County, California, that is held in fee by the Jamul Indian Village of California, as legally described in Document No. 2017-0410384 in the Official Records of the Office of the Recorder, San Diego County, California, and recorded September 7, 2017.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) part of the reservation of the Jamul Indian Village of California; and

(2) administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to property held in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian Tribe.

(d) GAMING PROHIBITED.—Land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall not be used for any class II gaming or class III gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (as those terms are defined in section 4 of that Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6443, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6443, the Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act, would place 172.1 acres of land owned in fee simple by the Jamul Indian Village into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

The Jamul Indian Village is located in San Diego County and is part of the Kumeyaay people of southern California, otherwise known as the Mission

Indians. While the Tribe's history dates back 12,000 years, it only received Federal recognition in 1981. The Tribe's reservation consists of approximately 6.04 acres, but the Tribe has continued to work to restore its land base.

Unfortunately, bureaucratic inefficiencies have delayed the process. The Tribe has submitted fee-to-trust applications for the parcels identified in this legislation, including one submitted in August 2015 that the Department of the Interior has not yet finalized.

This legislation would end that bureaucratic delay and place these parcels into trust. The legislation also would prohibit any class II or class III gaming pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act from occurring on the parcels to be placed into trust.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) for his work on this bill. I encourage the adoption of the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise also in support of H.R. 6443, the Jamul Indian Village Land Transfer Act.

The bill would take approximately 172 acres of land located in San Diego County, California, and owned in fee by the Jamul Indian Village of California, into trust for the benefit of the Tribe. The land in question contains four parcels, which include Tribal housing, council buildings, a historic church, and an ancestral cemetery. Each of these parcels is already within the Tribe's ancestral territory and is located near the Tribe's existing reservation.

I again want to acknowledge that land is the very essence of Tribal sovereignty, cultural survival, and economic prosperity in the future. That is why these land-into-trust transfers are so very important and why in Congress we should respond to them when they come before us and use them as another element of how we honor our trust responsibility to Tribes.

For that, I thank Representative ISSA for bringing this legislation forward.

Once the 172 acres have been placed into trust, the Tribe will be able to increase Tribal housing, preserve and protect cultural sites, and better provide essential governmental operations, including healthcare services, administrative offices, law enforcement, and other community resources such as a grocery store and educational services.

This bill honors the connection of the Tribe to its ancestral land and is a win for their self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair and ranking member for bringing this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, as Californians, our relationship with our Tribes and bands is different from that of many other places in the United States. The Kumeyaay Indians, including the Jamul band, were landless for decade after decade after decade. In fact, if not for the generosity of one landowner who allowed some of the Jamul Indians to get the 6 acres that they originally placed in trust, they might still be landless.

Those 6 acres were all they had to live on, and it wasn't enough for the various members because, unlike some immigrants, Native Americans lived here for thousands of years, and in those 13,000 years, they built a bond that could not be broken by the Spaniards and could not be broken by America as we annexed California.

In fact, as a landless Tribe, the Kumeyaay continued to practice their language and traditions even though they had to do so on whatever land they could find, usually not their own.

Since the 1980s, the Jamul band of Kumeyaay Indians has, in fact, clung to those 6 acres and amassed an ability to find additional plots of land.

It is ironic that one of the pieces of land we are considering today is, in fact, where they have been buried for more than 100 years, where they practice their Western faith taught to them by the Spaniards there on their land.

The other piece contains a farmhouse. It is a farmhouse where those Jamul Indians came to work in the fields of another man for decades. They have had the opportunity to buy that land now.

Many will say: But is there a conflict? Is there a reason for the Department of the Interior to take so long?

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no conflict about taking a cemetery where your dead are buried, or at least there shouldn't be.

The other piece of land was entitled by the County of San Diego to have more than twice as many homes on it as there are Jamul Indians. In fact, their intention is to preserve that farmhouse for all generations so that they can understand what life was like in San Diego County 100 years ago and so that their Tribal members will continue to celebrate those who treated them well when they had no land and no money.

Today, hopefully, we will put land in trust, but we will also celebrate the resilience of the Native Americans of California who stayed in the land of their birth even though they had their land taken from them for more than 600 years.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, as noted, this is a worthwhile bill for taking this land into trust.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would take approximately 172.1 acres of land owned in fee simple by the Jamul Indian Village into trust by the United States for the benefit of this Tribe. I thank Mr. ISSA for his work on this legislation to benefit his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of 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 Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6443.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS LAND INTO TRUST CONFIRMATION ACT OF 2023

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 382) to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 382

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 "Puyallup Tribe of Indians Land Into Trust Confirmation Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. LAND TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PUYALLUP TRIBE OF THE PUYALLUP RESERVATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The approximately 172.64 acres of land owned in fee by the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation in Pierce County, Washington, and described in subsection (b) is hereby taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) PARCEL 1.—Lots 1 to 4, inclusive, Block 85, Map of Tacoma Tidelands, as surveyed and platted by the Board of Appraisers of Tide and Shore Lands for Pierce County, according to Plat filed for record on September 14, 1895, in the Office of the County Auditor, in Tacoma, Pierce County, Washington.

(2) PARCEL 2.—Lots 5 to 9, inclusive, Block 85, Map of Tacoma Tidelands, as surveyed and platted by the Board of Appraisers of Tide and Shore Lands for Pierce County, according to Plat filed for record on September 14, 1895, in the Office of the County Auditor, in Tacoma, Pierce County, Washington.

(3) PARCEL 3.—Parcel A of City of Tacoma Boundary Line Adjustment MPD2011-40000166230, recorded October 12, 2011, under Pierce County Auditor Recording No. 20110125009, as corrected by Affidavit of Minor Correction of Map Recorded September 25, 2012, under Pierce County Auditor Recording No. 201209250440.