

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 17.264 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.

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

(1) part of the Reservation of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation; 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) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not be liable for any environmental contamination that occurred on the land described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which that land is taken into trust under subsection (a).

(e) 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 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) (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 include extraneous material on S. 382, 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, S. 382, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Land Into Trust Confirmation Act, would place approximately 17 acres of land in Pierce County, Washington, into trust for the Tribe.

The land in question is currently owned by the Tribe in fee simple, and the Tribe intends to use the land for economic development purposes to benefit the Tribe and the surrounding area.

The parcels contain evidence of environmental contamination, which complicates the process by which the Bureau of Indian Affairs would take land into trust through the administrative fee-to-trust process. Under an administrative process, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or BIA, would require full land remediation before the process even begins. This would be cost prohibitive for the Tribe and unnecessary given the Tribe's intended use of the land as a shipping terminal and transportation facility.

Additionally, S. 382 makes clear that the United States is not liable for any environmental contamination on the land and includes a prohibition on gaming pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

Mr. Speaker, 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 in support of S. 382, the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Land

Into Trust Confirmation Act of 2023, introduced by Senator CANTWELL and led in the House by my incredibly brilliant colleague from Washington, Representative KILMER.

We know that land is at the very essence of Tribal sovereignty, cultural survival, and economic sovereignty. That is why taking land into trust for Tribes, either through the BIA or congressional process, is essential if we are to honor our trust responsibilities to Tribes, if we are to honor our commitment to help reverse, if only by a few acres at a time, some of the worst of our Federal policies from the 19th and 20th centuries.

This bill would authorize the United States to take approximately 17.2 acres of land located in Pierce County, Washington, and owned by the Puyallup Tribe into trust for the benefit of the Tribe.

Typically, land is taken into trust under the Bureau of Indian Affairs administrative process. However, it is not uncommon for Tribes to take a legislative route depending on their circumstances.

In the case of the Puyallup Tribe, the Tribe identified legacy contamination from historical industrial sites when undergoing environmental site assessments.

When placing land into trust, the Federal Government does not take liability for environmental contamination that could have occurred prior to the transfer. As that is the case here, the BIA is unable to take the land into trust administratively, and congressional action through legislation is the most viable option for the Tribe in this case.

This legislation would move the Tribe's land-into-trust process forward and ultimately expand job and economic development opportunities. By adding these lands in the port area, the Tribe will be able to develop a 21st century shipping terminal that will help address the backlog facing our Nation's ports. Placing this land into trust will make this land the first international Tribal trade center in modern times. I say in modern times because we know there was much trade that was going on before European contact.

The Puyallup Tribe is a signatory to the Treaty of Medicine Creek of 1854, which designated 200,000 acres as permanent homeland for their people. However, the ink had barely dried on the treaty before efforts to take the Tribe's land began through acts of Congress, illegal sales of reservation land, and outright theft.

Given so much historical and cultural loss, it is appropriate to grant the restoration of these lands to the Tribe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Land Into Trust Confirmation Act, a critical piece of legislation that represents not only an act of justice, but a significant step toward economic revitalization and sustainable development in our region.

This bill, introduced by myself alongside my colleagues, Senator MARIA CANTWELL, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Representative MARILYN STRICKLAND, seeks to transfer over 17 acres of land currently owned by Puyallup Tribe into Federal trust.

This action is not merely administrative, it is a restoration of the Tribe's ancestral homeland, a place that holds a deep cultural and historical significance for the Puyallup people.

As the Puyallup Tribe's lands, after recent congressional redistricting, fall within the region I am privileged to represent, I am aware of the profound impact this legislation can have.

Indeed, it is not just about land. It is about enabling the Puyallup Tribe to further diversify and expand economic opportunities, to spur job creation at the Port of Tacoma and along the Tacoma waterfront, a vision of prosperity that benefits not only the Tribe, but the entire South Puget Sound region.

When we introduced this bill, I pointed out that this legislation will help restore the Tribe's homelands, ensuring the Tribe can continue to diversify and grow economic opportunities and create jobs across our region. I stand by those words today, committed to ensuring that the Federal Government upholds its trust and treaty obligations.

Last year, I attended the State of the Union address with Puyallup Tribal Chairman Bill Sterud as my guest. Chairman Sterud joined the Puyallup Tribal Council in 1978 and has served as chairman and vice-chairman several times since his first election.

Chairman Sterud is a proud father and grandfather of a University of Washington Husky, who frequently gives welcomes to incoming students at the UW Tacoma and graduates at UW commencement, and someone who cares deeply about his people and those who live in the surrounding community.

In his own words, Chairman Sterud believes that the land into trust act will help the Tribe diversify its economy and bring critical infrastructure and business to the Tribe's port development and the entire region. In other words, this is a game changer for the Puyallup Tribe.

Our Federal Government has a solemn duty to ensure that Tribal communities are afforded the same opportunities that have spurred growth and prosperity across other communities in our State and Nation. Moreover, by putting this land into trust, Congress

can help unlock a host of Federal programs and services that can catalyze significant economic development and infrastructure investments for the Puyallup Tribe and surrounding communities.

In Washington State, this proposal has garnered widespread support not only from within the Tribe, but also from the city of Tacoma, from Pierce County, from Washington Governor Jay Inslee, and the team at the Port of Tacoma.

This broad base of community support underscores the mutual benefits anticipated from this action, benefits that will surely extend well beyond the boundaries of the land in question, fostering a more vibrant, healthy, and economically robust Puget Sound region.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Land Into Trust Confirmation Act. I thank the gentlewoman from across the aisle for her support of it. I thank my colleague for her support of it.

Let us take this step together as a forward-looking investment in the economic vitality and cultural richness of the Pacific northwest.

Moving forward, Congress can honor its commitments to Native nations, respect our shared history, and work hand in hand with Tribes like the Puyallup to build a future of prosperity and partnership.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KILMER and Senator CANTWELL for bringing this legislation forward. I also thank Chairman Sterud and the people of the Puyallup Tribe because what they are doing here today is beneficial not only for the Tribe, but, as noted, for the entire region.

I think we will see this over and over again in the bills we are hearing today and that we will hear into the future with regards to taking land into trust. It benefits not just the Tribe and the local economy, but those who live around the Tribe. In this instance, because of the port, it will benefit the entire Nation. Therefore, we are grateful for the work that they have done in terms of pursuing this land-into-trust application.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would take approximately 17 acres of fee land in Pierce County, Washington, into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe to support the development of a 21st century shipping and transportation facility.

I thank the sponsors of this legislation for their work on behalf of their constituents. I 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 Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 382.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## SOUTH PACIFIC TUNA TREATY ACT OF 2023

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1792) to amend the South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1792

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “South Pacific Tuna Treaty Act of 2023”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Amendment of South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Prohibited acts.

Sec. 5. Exceptions.

Sec. 6. Criminal offenses.

Sec. 7. Civil penalties.

Sec. 8. Licenses.

Sec. 9. Enforcement.

Sec. 10. Findings by Secretary.

Sec. 11. Reporting requirements; disclosure of information.

Sec. 12. Closed Area stowage requirements.

Sec. 13. Observers.

Sec. 14. Technical assistance.

Sec. 15. Arbitration.

Sec. 16. Disposition of fees, penalties, forfeitures, and other moneys.

Sec. 17. Additional agreements.

### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SOUTH PACIFIC TUNA ACT OF 1988.

*Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the South Pacific Tuna Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 973 et seq.).*

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

(a) *APPLICABLE NATIONAL LAW.*—Section 2(4) (16 U.S.C. 973(4)) is amended by striking “described in paragraph 1(a) of Annex I of” and inserting “noticed and in effect in accordance with”.

(b) *CLOSED AREA.*—Section 2(5) (16 U.S.C. 973(5)) is amended by striking “of the closed areas identified in Schedule 2 of Annex I of” and inserting “area within the jurisdiction of a Pacific Island Party that is closed to vessels pursuant to a national law of that Pacific Island Party and is noticed and in effect in accordance with”.

(c) *FISHING.*—Section 2(6) (16 U.S.C. 973(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “for any purpose” after “harvesting of fish”; and

(2) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

“(F) use of any other vessel, vehicle, aircraft, or hovercraft, for any activity described in this paragraph except for emergencies involving the health or safety of the crew or the safety of a vessel.”.

(d) *FISHING VESSEL.*—Section 2(7) (16 U.S.C. 973(7)) is amended by striking “commercial fishing” and inserting “commercial purse seine fishing for tuna”.

(e) *LICENSING AREA.*—Section 2(8) (16 U.S.C. 973(8)) is amended by striking “in the Treaty Area” and all that follows and inserting “under the jurisdiction of a Pacific Island Party, except for internal waters, territorial seas, archipelagic waters, and any Closed Area.”.

(f) *LIMITED AREA; PARTY; TREATY AREA.*—Section 2 (16 U.S.C. 973) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (10), (13), and (18);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (11) and (12) as paragraphs (10) and (11), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (14) as paragraph (12); and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (15) through (17) as paragraphs (14) through (16), respectively.

(g) *REGIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.*—Section 2 (16 U.S.C. 973) is amended by inserting after paragraph (12), as so redesignated, the following:

“(13) The term ‘regional terms and conditions’ means any of the terms or conditions attached by the Administrator to the license issued by the Administrator, as notified by the Secretary.”.

#### SEC. 4. PROHIBITED ACTS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 5(a) (16 U.S.C. 973c(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as provided in section 6 of this Act, it” at the beginning and inserting “It”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (13) as paragraphs (3) through (11), respectively;

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by inserting “, except in accordance with an agreement pursuant to the Treaty” after “Closed Area”;

(5) in paragraph (10), as so redesignated, by striking “or” at the end;

(6) in paragraph (11), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) to violate any of the regional terms and conditions; or

“(13) to violate any limit on authorized fishing effort or catch.”.

(b) *IN THE LICENSING AREA.*—Section 5(b) (16 U.S.C. 973c(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Except as provided in section 6 of this Act, it” and inserting “It”;

(2) by striking paragraph (5); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

#### SEC. 5. EXCEPTIONS.

Section 6 (16 U.S.C. 973d) is repealed.

#### SEC. 6. CRIMINAL OFFENSES.

Section 7(a) (16 U.S.C. 973e(a)) is amended by striking “section 5(a) (8), (10), (11), or (12)” and inserting “paragraphs (6), (8), (9), or (10) of section 5(a)”.

#### SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTIES.

(a) *DETERMINATION OF LIABILITY; AMOUNT; PARTICIPATION BY SECRETARY OF STATE IN ASSESSMENT PROCEEDING.*—Section 8(a) (16 U.S.C. 973f(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Code” after “liable to the United States”; and

(2) by striking “Except for those acts prohibited by section 5(a) (4), (5), (7), (8), (10), (11), and (12), and section 5(b) (1), (2), (3), and (7) of this Act, the” and inserting “The”.

(b) *WAIVER OF REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.*—Section 8(g) (16 U.S.C. 973f(g)) is amended—