

after Guam's liberation. We have the opportunity by passing H.R. 1595 to correct a great injustice for those patriotic Americans who withstood brutal occupation.

The issue has been studied to exhaustion and the recommendations have remained the same. We should never forget their sacrifice for our country, nor should we allow for this iniquity to continue.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 1595—the Guam World War II Loyalty Act.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1595, the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act and urge my colleagues to support its passage. I want to begin by commending my colleague and friend from Guam, the Honorable MADELINE BORDALLO, for her steadfast and dedicated efforts towards enactment of this bill. Congresswoman BORDALLO has been singularly focused—since arriving in the House—on the enactment of legislation to provide compensation for those of her constituents who suffered unspeakable acts of horror during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam who were subject to public executions by beheading, personal injury, forced labor, forced march, rape and internment at the hands of the Japanese, have waited much too long for just compensation. The Guam War Claims Review Commission found that Guam's residents were inequitably treated under the Guam Meritorious Claims Act and subsequent Federal laws meant to address WWII personal injury claims.

This Commission, which was established pursuant to legislation sponsored by our former colleague from Guam, Robert Underwood, recommended that Congress enact legislation providing for additional compensation to Guam's residents. Thus the bill we are discussing today.

The struggle for fair compensation for the people of Guam has been on-going for more than 60 years now. Sadly many of the Chamorros who suffered these atrocities have passed away but we must not let their suffering, largely due to the steadfast loyalty to the United States, be in vain. Passage of H.R. 1595 is long overdue and by doing so today, we will honor their memories and provide compensation to these brave Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1595.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, 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. 1595, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1500

COLUMBIA-PACIFIC NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA STUDY ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 407) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area in the States of Washington and Oregon, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 407

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 "Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area Study Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term "Heritage Area" means the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STUDY AREA.—The term "study area" means—

(A) the coastal areas of Clatsop and Pacific Counties (also known as the North Beach Peninsula); and

(B) areas relating to Native American history, local history, Euro-American settlement culture, and related economic activities of the Columbia River within a corridor along the Columbia River eastward in Clatsop, Pacific, Columbia, and Wahkiakum Counties.

SEC. 3. COLUMBIA-PACIFIC NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the managers of any Federal land within the study area, appropriate State and local governmental agencies, tribal governments, and any interested organizations, shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the study area—

(1) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use, and are best managed through partnerships among public and private entities and by combining diverse and sometimes noncontiguous resources and active communities;

(2) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklife that are a valuable part of the national story;

(3) provides outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features;

(4) provides outstanding recreational and educational opportunities;

(5) contains resources important to the identified theme or themes of the Study Area that retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(6) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and local and State governments that are involved in the planning, have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles for all participants, including the Federal Government, and have demonstrated support for the concept of a national heritage area;

(7) has a potential local coordinating entity to work in partnership with residents,

business interests, nonprofit organizations, and local and State governments to develop a national heritage area consistent with continued local and State economic activity; and

(8) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

(c) PRIVATE PROPERTY.—In conducting the study required by this section, the Secretary shall analyze the potential impact that designation of the area as a national heritage area is likely to have on land within the proposed area or bordering the proposed area that is privately owned at the time that the study is conducted.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 fiscal years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary with respect to the study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 407, sponsored by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating a national heritage area in western Washington State. Specifically, the study would examine coastal areas in Clatsop and Pacific Counties at the mouth of the Columbia River, as well as inland areas along the river in two adjacent counties. The bill includes standard criteria for national heritage area studies, and requires completion of the study 3 years after the date funds are made available.

Mr. Speaker, the area included in this proposed study is not only beautiful, but is rich in Native American and European history. The area was a busy stop on European trade routes many years before Lewis and Clark famously visited the west coast. Representative BAIRD is to be commended for his hard work on behalf of this legislation. We look forward to working with him on the designation of a national heritage area should the study support such an action.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 407 for both procedural and substantive reasons. I am very dismayed that this bill has been

rushed to the floor with no hearing or subcommittee or full committee consideration by the Committee on Natural Resources. The majority might say a hearing was held on the bill last September, and no opposition was present so there is no need for consideration by the committee this year; but I strongly disagree with this logic for several reasons.

First, the committee has received a strong letter of opposition to H.R. 407 by one of the largest private property rights groups, the American Land Rights Association, based in Battle-ground, Washington.

That letter states: "We are curious why no hearings have been held on this bill during this Congress. Congress has the time and energy to congratulate victorious sports teams, but does not have the time and resources to hold a hearing on this bill which affects millions of acres of private property in Washington and Oregon."

Second, I note that one-eighth of the Members of this body, including me, are new Members of the House and were unable to participate in hearings held in the last Congress on this bill. Although there might be some cases where a consensus bill from the last Congress could justifiably be forwarded to the House for expedited consideration on the floor, this bill should not be one of them. As I said previously, it is strongly opposed by a private rights based group in the area affected by the bill.

The substantive reasons to oppose this bill can best be summarized by the American Land Rights Association's May 3, 2007, letter to the Committee on Natural Resources which states: "Although H.R. 407 is billed merely as a study, history shows the National Park Service rarely does a study that concludes a national heritage area is not feasible. Recent history also shows that national heritage areas cost the National Park Service \$10 million during their 15-year life span. Moreover, once their 15-year authorization expires, heritage area proponents come back to Congress asking for even more federal money so they can ultimately become 'self sufficient.' At a time when the National Park Service has a multi-billion dollar maintenance backlog for such basic visitor services as campgrounds, visitor centers and sanitation facilities, it should not be forced by Congress to create expensive new heritage areas that siphon precious federal dollars for these higher and better uses."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter I just referred to.

AMERICAN LAND RIGHTS
ASSOCIATION,
Battle Ground, WA, May 3, 2007.

Re H.R. 407 (Columbia-Pacific Heritage Area Study authored by Congressman Baird and Wu).

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL AND CONGRESSMAN YOUNG, The American Land Rights Association is headquartered in Southwest Washington State and is very involved with private property rights and land use issues here and throughout the United States.

We understand the House will soon consider H.R. 407, the Columbia-Pacific Heritage Area Study Act, which affects our members in this region. We are curious why no hearings have been held on this bill during this Congress. Congress has the time and energy to congratulate victorious sports teams but does not have the time and resources to hold a hearing on this bill that affects millions of acres of private property in Washington and Oregon.

Although H.R. 407 is billed as "merely as study," history shows the National Park Service rarely does a study that concludes a national heritage area is not feasible. Recent history also shows that national heritage areas cost the National Park Service \$10 million dollars during their 15-year life span. Moreover, once their 15-year authorization expires, heritage area proponents come back to Congress asking for even more federal money so they can ultimately become "self sufficient." At a time when the National Park Service has a multi-billion dollar maintenance backlog for such basic visitor services as campgrounds, visitor centers and sanitation facilities, it should not be forced by Congress to create expensive new heritage areas that siphon precious federal dollars for these higher and better uses.

The American Land Rights Association respectfully requests the House Committee on Natural Resources hold a balanced hearing on H.R. 407 before bringing this bill to the House Floor. We are astonished with the sense of urgency to pass this bill so early in the new Congress.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CUSHMAN,
Executive Director.

As I have stated publicly before, enacting legislation that actually works for the American people requires thoughtfulness and dialogue so all options are on the table. To reject that just because a numerical majority is available does a tremendous disservice to the American people. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 407.

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

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

I would first point out that almost identical legislation, H.R. 5485, was the subject of a subcommittee hearing in the Resources Committee during the previous Congress.

During that hearing, the Bush administration and local business leaders expressed support for the legislation. That hearing, organized by then-Republican majority, featured no testimony opposing the bill. Further, the companion to this bill was sponsored

by the Republican Senator from Oregon. Given that bipartisan and non-controversial legislative history, and the fact that the bill simply authorizes a study, it is perfectly appropriate that the measure be before the House today. We have used similar procedures to bring other measures left over from the previous Congress to the floor, measures sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats.

The one organization mentioned as opposing the bill failed to make their opposition known to the committee or the sponsor, nor did they testify at last year's hearing. Further, the group has no real relevance because it opposes all heritage area study proposals on ideological, rather than substantive, grounds which have nothing to do with this specific proposal.

Lastly, this legislation simply authorizes a study, not a national heritage area. To oppose the study because you assume you will oppose what the study will recommend is premature at best. There is no real controversy regarding this legislation, and we urge our colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), for such time as he may consume.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 407, the Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area Study Act.

The Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area Study Act is an important piece of legislation to my district and the entire Pacific Northwest. I have been privileged to work with DAVID WU from Oregon in introducing this legislation. In the Senate, the companion legislation has been introduced by Senator GORDON SMITH from Oregon and is supported by Washington Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL, as well as Oregon Senator RON WYDEN. Hence, this legislation has both bipartisan and bicameral support.

The mouth of the Columbia is a special place with a very rich history. Native American communities have flourished there for thousands of years. It is home to the first American settlement on the Pacific, Astoria. It served as a major trading post for European, American, Chinese, and other nations' ships, and earned its nickname the "Graveyard of the Pacific" from the hundreds of shipwrecks along its dangerous coast. Lewis and Clark ended their westward trek there in 1805. Today, the area is home to the fishing, seafood processing, and timber communities that embody the Pacific Northwest.

Establishing a national heritage area at the mouth of the river is fitting in recognition of the region and its importance historically. As you know, the national heritage area unites parts of historically and culturally significant areas under a common purpose. In this

case, it will help continue the cooperative efforts that the Lewis and Clark bicentennial helped to create. The bicentennial commemoration helped bring community interests together to plan and work in a collaborative fashion. A national heritage area will continue this momentum and ensure the region continues to attract families, outdoorsmen and women, history buffs, and others to enhance its sustainable tourism economy.

Most impressive is that the effort to create a national heritage area at the mouth of the Columbia is really an idea driven by the local community. We have received letters of support from local governments, local businesses, trade associations, chambers of commerce, ports and others who have heard about this effort and wholeheartedly endorsed it. A brief sample of support includes the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, the Office of the Governor of Oregon, the city of Astoria, Shorebank Pacific Bank, Cannon Beach Chamber of Commerce, the Port of Peninsula, and the Clatsop County Historical Society.

During the prior Congress, the legislation was subject to an oversight hearing in the National Parks Subcommittee where the administration expressed their support for the bill. We were also joined by small business owners from the area, notably Bob Andrews, who expressed his particular support.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the National Resource Committee chairman, NICK RAHALL; the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA; and their staffs, including David Watkins and Rick Healy, for their work in bringing this to the floor. I would also like to thank Marc Korman in my office for his work on this important legislation. And especially, my dear friend, DAVID WU. Again, I thank the Chair for bringing this to the floor and urge final passage.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the creation of a Columbia-Pacific National Heritage Area. I have worked closely with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), to introduce H.R. 407 to study the feasibility of a national heritage area at the mouth of the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington.

Like the river itself, the journey to get to where we are has been lengthy. In 2001, I took the initial steps with Mr. BAIRD and with the help of the National Resources Committee and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), and we were able to expand Fort Clatsop National Historic Monument and extend it to the sea.

Next, Congressman BAIRD and I together created Oregon's and Wash-

ton's newest national park, the Lewis and Clark National and State Historical Parks. No one person could have accomplished the many steps to this point. I thank the hard work of the Natural Resources Committee, Congressmen BAIRD and SOUDER, Oregon State Senator Betsy Johnson and former park superintendent Chip Jenkins.

I would especially like to thank all of the local citizens, such as Astoria's Cindy Mudge who has put tremendous time and effort into the heritage area. The history that shaped this part of our Nation should be preserved and celebrated.

Here, where the Columbia, the great river of the West, meets the ocean, strong men and women have left their indelible imprint for millennia. Native cultures, such as the Clatsop Nehalem, Chinook and other Indian tribes, were joined by the Spanish, Russians and British. Lewis and Clark began an American tie to the river, and Americans of diverse descent, including Americans of Scandinavian, Chinese and other heritages, together built the history of the region.

This is the way that America was or should be, a close-knit community where everyone, from the Indians to Lewis and Clark to Scandinavians to Chinese, were and are welcome; where work, and not parentage, determines one's worth.

From forestry to fisheries, the land and waters have provided. Today, human hands provide for the future. We are trying to build a college to help create the education and research-based economy of the future. Here also are the helping hands of the Columbia River bar pilots who since 1846 have guided ships across the Columbia River bar, and the United States Coast Guard, who faithfully protect local and international commerce on the roughest, toughest water in the world.

The mouth of the Columbia River presents layers of history and culture like an ancient buried city, except that the river rolls on today. Unlike the Hudson or the Mississippi, we do not have a large city at the river's mouth to preserve its stories and heritage; an act of Congress shall do so.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 407 and note that the opposition which has been expressed comes from an organization which is not within the historic study area.

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

□ 1515

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank my friend from Arizona.

I would just like to correct the record of the gentleman from Colorado. I know a little bit about Colorado myself. I have lived there. I doubt the gentleman from Colorado has lived in my district.

I do happen to know that Battle-ground, Washington, is not anywhere near the affected area. The affected area encompasses Pacific County and Wahkiakum County on my side of the river, two counties on the gentleman from Oregon's side of the river. Battle-ground is not there.

As far as the massive size of this organization you describe, it is not so large. I appreciate they have a voice. I am happy to listen to the voice. This Congress should listen to the voice. But it should not overwhelm the unanimous sense of the people who sponsored this legislation. The committee jurisdiction has had a hearing on this, and I do not think we want to make it the practice of this body, we certainly never have before, to say that every time a relatively noncontroversial bill has been heard well out in the prior Congress, we have to have another hearing.

If the gentleman pretends to say that it is his concern that we try to save the taxpayers' money, having continuous, multiple hearings every time a bill does not quite pass out both bodies, both the House and the Senate, from one Congress to the next, I think it would actually cost the taxpayers a lot more money than you would hope to save.

Let me speak to the substance of this. My friend from Oregon said it well. If you know the history of this great country and if you know the history of the Pacific Northwest, there can be no doubt that this area warrants designation such as we think this study will ultimately lend it.

My friend mentioned Lewis and Clark. Prior to them, the historical trade that went along among the native tribes at the mouth of the Columbia River was legendary. Lewis and Clark, the first American settlement in the Pacific Northwest, the key to trade with Asia in the early years of this great country, it was this mouth of this river where the first northwest settlement of the United States by Americans expanded. The mouth of this river is a key to the commerce, not only of the Pacific Northwest but the inland Northwest, the greater Northwest where great quantities of grain and other cargos are shipped out.

This region has a rich cultural, historical legacy that we need to honor and respect and preserve. That is why the administration supports this bill. That is why our friend and colleague in the other body, Senator SMITH, supports this bill. That is why we have I think the unanimous support of both delegations. This should be a noncontroversial bill.

The gentleman from Colorado I think has raised rather specious arguments against it, and I think we should pass this fine legislation and move forward with honoring a very richly deserving part of this country with this designation.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me thank the sponsors, Congressman BAIRD and Congressman WU, for this fine legislation and to remind our colleagues that this is the beginning of a process for a designation. This is the study process, and it is non-controversial. And as mentioned before, the organization opposing it has a protected record of opposing any heritage area, without any substantive qualification to that opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 407, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK EXTENSION ACT OF 2007

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1080) to modify the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park to include certain land within the GT Park Subdivision, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1080

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 "Grand Teton National Park Extension Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) PARK.—The term "Park" means the Grand Teton National Park.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) SUBDIVISION.—The term "Subdivision" means the GT Park Subdivision, with an area of approximately 49.67 acres, as generally depicted on—

(A) the plat recorded in the Office of the Teton County Clerk and Recorder on December 16, 1997, numbered 918, entitled "Final Plat GT Park Subdivision", and dated June 18, 1997; and

(B) the map entitled "2006 Proposed Grand Teton Boundary Adjustment", numbered 136/80,198, and dated March 21, 2006, which shall be on file and available for inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept from any willing donor the donation of any land or interest in land of the Subdivision.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) include the land or interest in the boundaries of the Park; and

(2) administer the land or interest as part of the Park, in accordance with all applicable laws (including regulations).

(c) DEADLINE FOR ACQUISITION.—It is the intent of Congress that the acquisition of land or an interest in land under subsection (a) be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) RESTRICTION ON TRANSFER.—The Secretary shall not donate, sell, exchange, or otherwise transfer any land acquired under this section without express authorization from Congress.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1080 was introduced by our colleague from Wyoming, Representative BARBARA CUBIN. The legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expand the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park to include approximately 50 acres that landowners in the adjacent Grand Teton Park Subdivision wish to donate to the park.

The subdivision is located adjacent to the park's eastern boundary and is visible from the park's main road. According to the National Park Service, the land is similar in character and quality to the adjacent parklands and offers unobstructed views of the Teton range and across the broad valley of Jackson Hole.

One lot in the subdivision was owned by the Gerald Halpin family. The remaining seven lots were donated by the Halpin family to private organizations, including the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the National Park Foundation, and the Grand Teton National Park Foundation.

All of these owners would like to donate their land to the park, but the parcels lie outside the existing park boundary. The 1950 law creating the park includes a provision forbidding expansion of any national park or monument in Wyoming without the express authorization of Congress.

H.R. 1080 would authorize the Secretary to accept the donation of lands within the subdivision and, upon acquisition, adjust the boundary of Grand Teton National Park. The bill would also prohibit the future sale, donation, exchange or other transfer of the acquired land without congressional approval.

Related legislation passed the other body in the 109th Congress and has been reintroduced by Senator CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming and approved by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service has testified in support of the bill, and it cleared the National Parks, Forests and Public Lands Subcommittee, and the full Natural Resources Committee on voice votes without any amendments.

Mr. Speaker, Representative CUBIN is to be commended for her work on this legislation. We support passage of H.R. 1080 and urge its adoption by the House today.

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

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

H.R. 1080, introduced by our colleague Congresswoman BARBARA CUBIN, would modify the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park to include 49 acres of privately donated land. I commend Mrs. CUBIN for her work on this legislation. This highly valuable land, which has been valued at nearly \$20 million, is being conveyed to the Park Service at very minimal cost.

Representative CUBIN and her staff did an excellent job working with the private individuals and groups who are donating the land and with the Park Service. The 49 acres are beautiful and highly desirable land that will enhance Grand Teton National Park.

This noncontroversial bill was favorably reported by the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1080.

I would also like to add that our thoughts and prayers are with Representative CUBIN and her husband, Dr. Cubin. We wish him a quick and speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1080.

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.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 487) to amend the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act to provide compensation to members of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe for damage resulting from the