

The release of the \$28 million to the members of the Chippewa Tribe will have positive implications far beyond just righting a past wrong. This money will flow directly into the hands of the bands and their members, sparking much needed consumer activity and, hopefully, investment in the reservations in northern Minnesota. This will benefit the entire region.

H.R. 1272 is the solution that must be enacted in order to fulfill the U.S. Government's legal obligations, conclude its litigation with the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, and release over \$28 million in settlement funds in a fair and expeditious manner. Thus, I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me in support of the bill that brings resolution to this longstanding issue.

Mr. LUJAN. If my friend doesn't have any other speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation.

And I misspoke a moment ago. Congressman COLLIN PETERSON has been fighting this battle for years and years, and I'm glad to finally see that he has succeeded. He is the prime sponsor of this legislation, along with Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. PAULSEN. So we're on the right track. And I want to congratulate you. Perseverance overcomes many things, and you persevered this time.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge the passage of this legislation.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1272, Minnesota Chippewa Tribe Judgment Fund Distribution Act of 2012. As a Member of the Native American Caucus, I have worked with my colleagues in Congress to address the needs of Native Americans.

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe for the amount, plus interest, that the Tribe contributed for the payment of attorneys' fees and litigation expenses associated with the litigation of Docket No. 19 and No. 188 before the U.S. Court of Federal Claims and the distribution of judgment funds.

This legislation before us today is not a handout, but a guarantee that directs the fair distribution of funds to a claim awarded to Native Americans by the United States Court of Federal Claims; these funds have been held in trust since June 22, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, by today's end four Native American bills will have passed. I hope that these are not the last. While we can't undo the damage that the Federal Government inflicted on black farmers and Native Americans, today we will help compensate them for their losses and ensure that this never happens again. I urge my colleagues to continue supporting Native Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1272, 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.

GILA BEND INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS REPLACEMENT CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2938) to prohibit certain gaming activities on certain Indian lands in Arizona, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2938

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 "Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1986, Congress passed the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act, Public Law 99-503, 100 Stat. 1798, to authorize the Tohono O'odham Nation to purchase up to 9,880 acres of replacement lands in exchange for granting all right, title and interest to the Gila Bend Indian Reservation to the United States.

(2) The intent of the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act was to replace primarily agriculture land that the Tohono O'odham Nation was no longer able to use due to flooding by Federal dam projects.

(3) In 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which restricted the ability of Indian tribes to conduct gaming activities on lands acquired after the date of enactment of the Act.

(4) Since 1986, the Tohono O'odham Nation has purchased more than 16,000 acres of land. The Tohono O'odham Nation does not currently game on any lands acquired pursuant to the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act.

(5) Beginning in 2003, the Tohono O'odham Nation began taking steps to purchase approximately 134.88 acres of land near 91st and Northern Avenue in Maricopa County, within the City of Glendale (160 miles from the Indian tribe's headquarters in Sells). The Tohono O'odham Nation is now trying to have these lands taken into trust status by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act of 1986 ("Gila Bend Act"), and has asked the Secretary to declare these lands eligible for gaming, thereby allowing the Indian tribe to conduct Las Vegas style gaming on the lands. The Secretary has issued an opinion stating that he has the authority to take approximately 53.54 acres of these lands into trust status, and plans to do so when legally able to do so.

(6) The State of Arizona, City of Glendale, and at least 12 Indian tribes in Arizona oppose the Tohono O'odham Nation gaming on these lands. No Indian tribe supports the Tohono O'odham Nation's efforts to conduct gaming on these lands.

(7) The Tohono O'odham Nation's proposed casino violates existing Tribal-State gaming compacts and State law, Proposition 202, agreed to by all Arizona Indian tribes, which effectively limits the number of tribal gaming facilities in the Phoenix metropolitan area to seven, which is the current number of facilities operating.

(8) The Tohono O'odham casino proposal will not generate sales taxes as the State Gaming Compact specifically prohibits the imposition of any taxes, fees, charges, or assessments.

(9) The proposed casino would be located close to existing neighborhoods and a newly built school and raises a number of concerns. Homeowners, churches, schools, and businesses made a significant investment in the area without knowing that a tribal casino would or even could locate within the area.

(10) The development has the potential to impact the future of transportation projects, including the Northern Parkway, a critical transportation corridor to the West Valley.

(11) The Tohono O'odham Nation currently operates three gaming facilities: 2 in the Tucson metropolitan area and 1 in Why, Arizona.

(12) Nothing in the language or legislative history of the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act indicates that gaming was an anticipated use of the replacement lands.

(13) It is the intent of Congress to clarify that lands purchased pursuant to the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Act are not eligible for Class II and Class III gaming pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. Such lands may be used for other forms of economic development by the Tohono O'odham Nation.

SEC. 3. GAMING CLARIFICATION.

Section 6(d) of Public Law 99-503 is amended by inserting "except that no class II or class III gaming activities, as defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703), may be conducted on such land if such land is located north of latitude 33 degrees, 4 minutes north" after "shall be deemed to be a Federal Indian Reservation for all purposes".

SEC. 4. NO EFFECT.

The limitation on gaming set forth in the amendment made by section 3 shall have no effect on any interpretation, determination, or decision to be made by any court, administrative agency or department, or other body as to whether any lands located south of latitude 33 degrees, 4 minutes north taken into trust pursuant to this Act qualify as lands taken into trust as part of a settlement of a land claim for purposes of title 25 U.S.C. 2719(b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 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 Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, Congressman FRANKS from Arizona.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman YOUNG and Chairman HASTINGS and the House leadership for bringing this bill to the floor today, as well as the bipartisan group of cosponsors for their support.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2938, the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act, seeks to prevent Las Vegas-style casino gambling in the Phoenix metropolitan area on lands purchased by the Tohono O'odham Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Tohono O'odham Nation has tried to manipulate the

Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act of 1986 to acquire lands for gambling which are more than 100 miles from the Tohono O'odham's existing reservation. This "reservation shopping" for casino gambling purposes is contrary to the express and public commitments that the Tohono O'odham made between 2000 and 2002 to the other 16 Indian tribes in Arizona, the State, and the voters of Arizona when it openly and definitively supported passage of Proposition 202, a State referendum to limit casino gambling in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Indeed, while the Tohono O'odham was in negotiations with the other tribes to craft a gaming compact agreement, they were simultaneously in the process of covertly purchasing attractive land in the Phoenix metropolitan area for casino gambling purchases. Thus, the bipartisan cosponsors of H.R. 2938 are simply trying to keep the Tohono O'odham Nation to its publicly stated commitment not to engage in casino gambling in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, during the subcommittee hearing on this bill, witnesses made it clear that there is a problem and a serious threat to existing gaming structure in Arizona if the Tohono O'odham Nation is able to develop a Las Vegas-style casino in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

The passage of H.R. 2938 will prevent an ominous precedent that could lead to an expansion of off-reservation casinos and dangerous changes to the complexion of tribal gaming in the other States across the country in which Indian tribes can use front companies to buy up land and declare it part of their sovereign reservation for gaming purposes.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, even if the casino weren't in violation of Federal law—which it is—but if it weren't, claims that the operation would create jobs and benefit the economy of the surrounding area are woefully misinformed at best and shamefully dishonest at worst. The most frequently cited job creation numbers that have been thrown about during this debate come almost without exception from a study commissioned by the Tohono O'odham tribe themselves. The study was conducted by the Spectrum Gaming Group. Tellingly, multiple organizations asked the tribe to release the data and the methodology supporting this so-called "study," which was released roughly 3 years ago. To this day, the tribe continuously to steadfastly refuse. In other words, the tribes released a slew of numbers extolling the supposed amazing economic benefits of their casino, then refused to tell anybody how they came up with the numbers.

Far from economically benefiting the West Valley, one recent well documented study found that casino operations would ultimately provide \$172,500 of revenue annually for the

city of Glendale—keep in mind the surrounding areas would not benefit from the normal sales taxes, bed taxes, and property taxes because the casino, being on tribal land, would be exempt from all three. Meanwhile, Glendale estimates an added cost of \$3.6 million per year just for the additional cost of public safety services necessary to such a large operation. Of course, it should always be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that casino revenues are primarily comprised of gambling losses that would otherwise have found their way into the economy in more productive sectors.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would not seek to take any lands away from Tohono O'odham. Consistent with the intent of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, my bill merely prevents the Tohono O'odham from building a gambling casino on certain lands, as it previously agreed it would never do.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to join me and the members of Arizona's delegation in supporting this bill.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me thank my good friend, Mr. LUJÁN from New Mexico, for his time.

H.R. 2938 is named the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act. However, do not be misled by this bill's benign sounding title. It does not aim to clarify anything. Rather, it seeks to unilaterally abrogate an Indian land claim and water rights settlement, and it would also interfere with pending litigation in Federal court.

In 1986, the United States enacted Federal legislation specific to this tribe and this situation. The Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act, Public Law 99-503, was to implement a settlement reached between the United States and the Tohono O'odham Nation. In this settlement, the nation released claims against the United States for flooding and loss of its land, as well as water rights of 36,000 acre feet per year. In exchange for releasing the claims, Congress guaranteed, via statute, that the nation could obtain replacement reservation lands within three counties without restriction as to the use of that land.

□ 1920

H.R. 2938 seeks to renege on Congress' solemn promise and change the material terms of the settlement; this while Congress contemplates in a very real way breaking its word to Indian Country one more time. The legislation will reopen and change the terms of a 1986 bipartisan land settlement authored by Congressman Mo Udall, then-Congressman JOHN MCCAIN, then-Senator Dennis DeConcini, and then-Senator Barry Goldwater that compensated the Tohono O'odham Nation for 10,000 acres of land destroyed by the Army Corps of Engineers in the 1950s.

By violating an existing settlement, this legislation will create new liabilities for the Federal Government, as taxpayers will have to provide more compensation to the nation as a result of prohibiting the purchase of replacement lands, as provided in the original settlement act.

Enactment of this legislation would also set a dangerous precedent in which Congress could unilaterally alter the terms of a Federal settlement years later. If this is the case that would stop Congress from revisiting any settlements over the years, then all settlements are open for review.

H.R. 2938 is job-killing special interest legislation. The primary advocates for this legislation are wealthy gaming entities, tribal entities trying to protect their monopoly on a gaming market. If they get their way, they will prevent the Tohono O'odham Nation from creating thousands of new jobs, permanent and construction.

It reneges on the United States' promise to replace the reservation lost, and it vastly diminishes the Tohono O'odham settlement by imposing new restrictions on the land replacement provided for in the 1986 settlement.

It creates new liabilities for the United States. If this were to become law, H.R. 2938, it will breach the settlement act, and it will leave the United States liable for untold millions of dollars in land and taking claims for the land and water rights that the nation relinquished under the original settlement act.

And it undermines ongoing litigation. The same interests that support H.R. 2938 have brought various lawsuits to stop the nation from exercising its rights. But so far, both State and Federal courts have fully upheld the Tohono O'odham Nation's rights. The proponents of H.R. 2938 want Congress to change the law in order to legislate a victory that they cannot get through legislation.

In addition, misinformation, distortion, and outright lies have been spread through congressional offices by a major lobbying firm in D.C. in the employment of a gaming entity that is opposed to the original law and is promoting this law.

This has nothing to do with "reservation shopping." In no way would defeating this bill allow tribes to start buying up plots of land outside of, say, New York City and open up casinos. The original act was specific only to the Tohono O'odham. The replacement land could be only purchased in one of three Arizona counties. In fact, the land in question is in the exact same county, Maricopa, where the flooded land of Gila Bend reservation was located.

So I think it's time to stop this. This land was purchased legally by the Tohono O'odham Nation, all in accordance with the Gila Bend Reservation Land Replacement Act, to replace reservation land the U.S. Government flooded and destroyed, to be used by

the nation at their discretion for economic development. The innuendo of reservation shopping or the idea that its defeat will cause rampant reservation shopping is absurd, and it needs to stop.

I also want to address the idea that compact guaranteed no new casinos in the Phoenix area. If this was the case, the only casinos that would exist in the Phoenix area are the ones that were in existence in 2003. But lo and behold, the very tribes supporting this legislation have built two additional casinos since then. In fact, one of these tribes is about to break ground on a new \$135 million Las Vegas-style casino and hotel right outside of southwest Phoenix.

And, finally, let's stop the lies about the administration being "neutral" on this bill. They have testified against it. I have spoken to them. Their position hasn't changed, and the administration does not support this legislation.

This legislation is causing disparate treatment of one tribe for the sake of protecting a market. The market should be competitive. This is not a violation of the Arizona Gaming Compact, but it is an abrogation of a law this Congress passed in 1986 that is now being changed due to the whims of those afraid of a competitive market.

I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my friend TRENT FRANKS' legislation, H.R. 2938.

Ten years ago, stakeholders from across the State of Arizona gathered together to come up with a 21st-century plan to manage gaming activity. As part of that final agreement, many tribes agreed to forgo building a casino to share revenues as a whole. Gaming revenues were set aside for education, health care, and other measures to improve the lives of average tribal members.

The key part of that compact was a tribal agreement that no new additional casinos would be permitted in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The Tohono O'odham Nation agreed to those terms; but as they agreed to one thing publicly, they were preparing privately to undermine the entire agreement. The tribe has since acquired land in Glendale and has made it clear they intend to break their agreement and establish a casino on that land. This legislation ensures the Tohono O'odham Nation must keep the promise they made in 2002 to the other tribes, the State, and our constituents.

Additionally, the small, but vocal, opposition to this legislation claims the bill before us seeks to unilaterally nullify an Indian water rights settlement. I assure my House colleagues that statement is false. Water rights associated with the Gila Bend reservation were settled in the Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act of 2004, not the Gila Bend Act.

The passage of H.R. 2938 would not affect the State adjudication of water rights. Any claims to water rights based on aboriginal occupancy that Tohono might have claimed were also waived in the tribe's separate water rights settlement, an act that provided for a complete and total waiver of all such water rights in exchange for substantial consideration and payments. Last fall, the Department of the Interior testified on this bill, and water rights were not mentioned. The committee resolved any concerns during the markup of the bill.

Today's debate is not about jobs or Native American water rights. It is about protecting the integrity of Arizona's gaming compact and preventing a dangerous precedent that could lead to the expansion of off-reservation casinos in other States.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2938.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

H.R. 2938 should not have been brought to the House floor under suspension of the rules. This legislation doesn't name a post office or authorize a park study. H.R. 2938, instead, is a highly controversial piece of legislation that will amend a settlement agreement between the United States and an Indian tribe, impose restrictions on a tribe's authority to use its own land, and circumvent years of Federal and State court rulings.

During consideration by the Natural Resources Committee, members from both sides of the aisle expressed concern with this measure. House Members have heard from tribes across the country, Arizona State legislators, local mayors, small business owners, and community leaders on both sides of this issue. The number of stakeholders with strong feelings on both sides of this issue is plain evidence that the bill does not belong on suspension.

□ 1930

So we're here tonight, and the implications for local, regional, and national gaming industry precedents are quite significant. We should only bring suspension-worthy bills out here on the floor. I say that because Mr. GRIJALVA from Arizona, whose tribal constituents are the sole target of this legislation, is being denied this opportunity and, therefore, any chance to address his constituents' needs. And I think that since it does affect his district, his tribe, he's on the Natural Resources Committee, he deserves the right to be able to make amendments that can improve this legislation, and he is not going to be allowed to do that.

So that is my view on this bill, that it's under the wrong process. Suspensions are really meant for bills that do not bring the level of complexity and the level of controversy that a bill like this brings to the House floor, and as a result, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I have one more speaker.

Mr. LUJAN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) stated the facts very clearly. In the 1950s, the Federal Government condemned and seized land and water rights owned by the Tohono O'odham Indian Nation. In 1986, Congress settled the tribe's outstanding claims by agreeing, in part, to take into trust replacement land that the Tohono O'odham might acquire under specific conditions. The tribe has acquired a particular parcel meeting all of the conditions set forth in the law and asserted its rightful claim under that law. This bill retroactively and fundamentally alters that settlement, breaking the promises the Tohono O'odham have relied upon as they've spent many years and millions of dollars acquiring this parcel and planning the project.

Now, why in the world would we want to do such a thing? Well, it's obvious. Like many tribes, the Tohono O'odham want to build a casino on this land. This casino would compete with another tribe's casino in the region, and that tribe doesn't want the competition. Competition is so annoying and inconvenient. It requires offering your customers a better service at a lower price. Tohono O'odham seeks to do that. The other tribe doesn't want to.

So that other tribe, which has a monopoly on gaming in the Phoenix area, created a front made up of antigambling pressure groups and NIMBY activists to try and stop them. They have been defeated in the courts at every turn. So what to do? What to do? They don't want to compete for customers. They don't have a leg to stand on in court. What is left? Well, of course. Get Congress to break its promise, which is why we're all here tonight.

Let's be very clear about what passing this bill would mean. Many in this House have widely criticized the President for killing thousands of jobs to satisfy his ideological opposition to the Keystone pipeline. Well, this bill does exactly the same thing. It kills 6,000 construction jobs and 3,000 permanent, ongoing service jobs by blocking this project on ideological grounds. But the damage only begins there. Federal taxpayers will become liable for hundreds of millions of dollars of economic damages to compensate the Tohono O'odham for lost profits, for the devaluation of their property, and for years of planning suddenly rendered worthless by this act.

So what's the balance sheet here? On the plus side, we satisfy the ideological itch of antigaming busybodies and antigrowth zealots, and we protect a gambling monopoly in Phoenix from any competition. On the minus side, we

destroy 6,000 construction jobs, 3,000 service jobs, and we open our constituents to hundreds of millions of dollars of damages that we are certain to lose in court.

I would suggest that this bill ought to be laughed off the floor, but there's nothing in it to laugh about.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I come to this with a somewhat unique view, because I was actually there 19 years ago as the majority whip in the Arizona State House when this was originally being negotiated. I sat in the room hour after hour after hour for months with many of these Native American communities and these very discussions about what would happen in this type of scenario and assurances that were given to those of us who were in the legislature who were having to make the decision that this would never happen.

And I've listened to a little bit of this testimony, even from my good friend here from California, and the facts don't line up. First off, in the gaming agreements, in the compacts, there's the language about the distance from the base aboriginal territories and how far things could move away from that. This is outside that. The jobs numbers are an absolute fantasy for the construction. And I think Mr. FRANKS actually went over that in his discussion earlier.

But why do I stand here so passionately supporting TRENT's bill? If this happens, it's going to destroy the nature of my State because, understand, the compacts go kaboom, the cascade begins. And this isn't just for Arizona. It will be all over the country. I promise you, in a few years you will wake up and my State will be a statewide gaming State. And then when this becomes precedent, understand, all your States are now in play.

This is more than just us having a dispute with the Tohono O'odhams. That isn't what this is about. This is about keeping the promises that were made for many of us who were embattled in building these compacts years ago.

Let's have everyone keep their promise, and let's keep the deal we made.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? If he doesn't have the time, I will yield him additional time.

Does the tribe in question have a casino on their own property?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Oh, yes. I think they have multiple casinos.

There's another fact that bounced up here, Mr. Speaker. There's actually, I think, one, two, three, four, five casinos in the urban area by, I think, three different Native American communities. This isn't about defending one tribe versus another. This is about there's 21 tribes in Arizona and the agreements that have been put to-

gether. Heaven forbid what you're going to do to these communities, particularly the rural ones that get some of the sharing, if we blow up the compacts through my State.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any more speakers?

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, yes, I do.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. LUJÁN.

Just, I think, important points to clarify. One is that the Tohono O'odham Nation's proposed gaming facility in this land that was authorized by Congress would violate its tribal-State gaming compact, or Prop 202. The Department of the Interior has spoken clearly on this issue and confirmed in section 3(j) of the tribal-State gaming compact clearly allows the nation to develop a gaming facility on the land. Nothing in Proposition 202 would disallow the nation from gaming in the Phoenix metropolitan area, as the other five to six casinos show that there were gentlemen's agreements for no additional casinos in Phoenix.

Well, there was no such side deal. The line of argument is, I think, an after-the-fact rationalization for a position that is entirely unsupported by the letter of the law. The compact has stated all elements of tribal-State gaming agreements must be embodied in the compact and must be approved by the Department of the Interior.

I think that we have to look at what has not been said. The United States' breach, if this becomes law, will void the nation's release of its original land claims and open the United States to a liability that was valued at \$100 million in 1986 dollars. The breach will also open the portion of the nation's original water claims settlement. This settlement is key to the negotiations going on now with the Salt River Project, the Central Arizona Water Conservation District, the State of Arizona, the Maricopa-Stanfield Water District, and the Central Arizona Irrigation District, all affecting the very precious commodity in Arizona, which is water.

So at the expense of those liabilities, that breach could cause not only the State of Arizona, but the United States taxpayer, millions and millions of dollars and loss in settlements that are so vitally needs around the water issues affecting Arizona and the West.

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

□ 1940

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I can say that this is somewhat difficult for me because I have a rule about laws that are being passed in Members' districts, and I usually support. Mr. FRANKS represents that district.

And I will say, Mr. GRIJALVA has made some statements. I would suggest

Congress makes laws, and Congress can remake laws. Lawsuits, that's a scare tactic. They can sue all they want. One of the problems we have in America today is we have too many lawyers, so you can sue anything and anybody, anytime, anywhere.

This is a battle about a State and a large group of American Natives that reached an agreement. Mr. GOSAR said this very clearly. He was there, and they reached an agreement and they are signatories. We had a hearing on this legislation. We had a quite intensive hearing, and that was brought up. And, of course, they can cite all the arguments they want, but they also understand that when a State is involved under Native gaming laws, which I and Mr. Udall sponsored, the State had to be directly involved; otherwise, you wouldn't have gambling anywhere in Arizona because the State would not have agreed to that if there hadn't been an agreement between all of the tribes, there would be no more than was established in the compact. And I think we have to consider the State's belief in this because that does affect the State. They probably wouldn't have any gambling at all.

This money from those five existing casinos is shared, even by the tribe requesting this casino outside their territory where they have their own casinos, they want it in the Phoenix area, and we all know that. This is about money. There's no doubt about that. But what concerns me the most is the compact. When I listen to this, when you make an agreement and you're a tribe and you agree to something, don't try to go around and change that later on by asking some lawyers. We talk about finances and where the finances are coming from. We can find that out, too, later on.

So with the understanding that this is an Arizona battle, but as chairman, I have to listen to both sides, and right now I come down on the side that Arizona, the State of, has an agreement, and we ought to live by it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2938, the Gila Bend Indian Reservation Lands Replacement Clarification Act.

I support this important legislation because I believe we should all be bound by the agreements we make.

In the late 1990s, Arizona tribes' gaming ventures were being threatened by litigation and anti-Indian gaming interests.

As a response, a number of tribes formed a coalition to create a joint negotiating position before entering into tribal compact discussions with state officials.

One of these tribes was the Tonoho O'odham Nation.

Following this agreement, proposition 202 was passed, limiting Phoenix area casinos to seven.

Through all this time, the Tonoho O'odham Nation never expressed any hesitation to the agreement they signed with other tribes or Proposition 202, until now.

I ask my colleagues to support this important measure because it upholds the good

faith negotiations that were conducted to reach this joint power resolution between the Arizona Tribes.

I ask my colleagues to support it because it upholds the integrity of all the other tribes who have and still are living up to their word.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2938, 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. GRIJALVA. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CRISIS IN SYRIA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Syria is getting worse and worse and worse. I join with the United Nations, but I ask that the Arab League and NATO raise their voices to remove women and children and the elderly and the disabled and the sick from this onslaught of violence.

And I ask the head of Russia, Mr. Putin, does he have a heart? Is he going to continue on the basis of ego and collaboration, determined that he allow the violence against the Syrian people to continue?

I ask my Christian friends in Syria, as well, to join with the world of humanity to stop the violence against women and children. It is time now.

ONE VOTE, ONE PERSON

Mr. Speaker, I change to another topic very quickly and say: one vote, one person. The voter ID law doesn't allow that, and the massive infusion of dollars coming from places that no one knows, no one has to account for. Let us have the Constitution stand again. Let America have a 2012 election without the infusion of unnamed dollars; now, \$100 million may be coming into this election from one person. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution deserves respect—one vote, one person.

CLEARING THE NAMES OF JOHN BROW AND BROOKS GRUBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I won't take the entire hour, but this is a 10-year journey that I have been on since

I was notified by the wife of one of the pilots, Connie Gruber, who lives in my district, that the very tragic plane crash on April 8, 2000, when 19 marines were killed in a V-22 Osprey, that her husband, Major Brooks Gruber and Colonel John Brow, pilots, were being blamed for the accident. Nineteen marines that night were killed. And again, 10 years ago I was contacted by Mrs. Gruber, who lives in Jacksonville, North Carolina, which is the home of Camp Lejeune Marine Base.

Mr. Speaker, I have, for the House, a photograph of the V-22 Osprey that many people might have forgotten. In the year 2000, it was a plane going through a lot of trouble, meaning from the standpoint of testing, standpoint of records being changed, and the standpoint that the Secretary of Defense at the time, Dick Cheney, wanted to scrap the program. But the Marine Corps was saying that they had to have the MV-22. And again, Mr. Speaker, for you to know, this is the plane that goes from a helicopter mode to an airplane mode, that the nacelles will go from this way to a plane mode. I have this beside me so that people can see the V-22. The pilot was Colonel John Brow. He's pictured immediately on my left, and the copilot to the poster's left was Major Brooks Gruber.

Connie Gruber wrote me a letter. It's a full page, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to just read what she said, just one paragraph:

With so many wrongs in the world we cannot make right, I ask you prayerfully consider an injustice that you can make right. I realize you alone may not be able to amend the report, but you can certainly support my efforts to permanently remove this black mark from my husband's honorable military service record.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when there was an issue involving the V-22 that the Marine Corps did not recognize, nor did Bell-Boeing, the manufacturer of the plane. It's called vortex ring state, VRS, and it's where the different, the two helicopter nacelles can be impacted in a different way, and that's what caused this tragic accident on April 8, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, right after the accident, the Marine Corps sent three investigators—Colonel Mike Morgan, Colonel Ron Radich, and Major Phil Stackhouse—to Arizona to investigate this accident, which was very, very difficult for the marines who were given the responsibility to find out why this plane crashed and burned.

Mr. Speaker, they came back and completed what was known as the JAGMAN report that was submitted to the Marine Corps. The investigators, this was their findings of what caused the accident.

□ 1950

This is what has created the problem is that the Marine Corps issued a press release that I will talk about in just a few minutes. And the JAGMAN the families agreed with. Everything in the JAGMAN they agree with. And I'll touch on that in just a moment.

I also at this time want to thank Congressman STENY HOYER from Maryland, who is the Congressman for the wife of the pilot. Her name is Trish Brow. She has two sons, Matthew and Michael. Mr. HOYER has joined me in clearing the names of these two pilots, and I want to thank him again for that.

In addition, Congressman NORM DICKS from the State of Washington, who will be leaving this year, has heard me speak on the floor about this accident, and he also wants to join in clearing the names of these two pilots.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank attorney Jim Furman in Texas. Attorney Jim Furman represented Connie Gruber and Trish Brow in the lawsuit against Bell-Boeing. In addition, Brian Alexander and his associate, Francis Young, were the attorneys for the 17 Marine families. So those two attorneys, Jim Furman and Brian Alexander, have joined me in clearing the names of John Brow and Brooks Gruber.

Mr. Speaker, I must state that they won their case against Bell-Boeing. The amount of money allotted to the families has been secured, so therefore no one knows except the families; but it tells me a whole lot when a manufacturing company decides that they would rather settle out of court than take the case to court.

Phil Coyle, the Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation in the Department of Defense at the time of this accident, has also joined us in clearing the names of the two pilots. Also, shortly after the accident in the year 2002, CBS "60 Minutes," led by Mike Wallace, who is now deceased, gave the story of what happened and why this plane crashed and why the two pilots should not be seen at fault.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many people in this 10-year journey. Local press in eastern North Carolina all the way to press in Texas have joined us in this effort to say to Connie Gruber and Trish Brow and their sons and their daughter: your husbands were not at fault.

Why the Marine Corps will not join in this effort I do not understand. All the Marine Corps has to do is to issue a paragraph that clearly states to Trish Brow that your husband, John Brow, Colonel John Brow, pilot, was not at fault for the accident that occurred on April 8, 2000, in Marana, Arizona. All the Marine Corps has to do is to write a paragraph on the commandant stationery to Connie Gruber stating the same thing, except: your husband, Major Brooks Gruber, copilot, was not at fault for the accident that happened on April 8, 2000, in Marana, Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, you might think—and maybe some people watching tonight might think—well, why is this so difficult? The lawsuits are over, the plane is surviving, there's no threat to the Marine Corps that they're going to eliminate the V-22. It is part of their