

system, but it also addresses the funding concerns of the Office of the United States Trustee.

This bill is a bipartisan measure that enjoys broad support from outside groups, including the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, and the American College of Bankruptcy. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

Mr. CICALLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2266, the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017,” which authorizes the establishment of four additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships and converts 14 temporary bankruptcy judgeships to permanent status.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, which is a necessary response to alleviate the strain on certain bankruptcy courts that have experienced a significant increase in bankruptcy filings over the past decade or more.

Importantly, this legislation adopts the recommendations of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the national policymaking body of the federal courts, and does not impose additional fees on ordinary consumer debtors or small businesses.

As the Conference notes in support of this measure, while bankruptcy filings have decreased nationwide, the bankruptcy courts that would receive permanent or new judgeships under this legislation “have seen weighted filings increase by more than 55 percent.”

Furthermore, without this legislation, all 14 temporary judgeships covered by this bill will lapse later this month on May 25.

Allowing a lapse in these judgeships would have potentially crippling effects on the bankruptcy system.

For example, five of the six authorized judgeships of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court of the District of Delaware—the preferred venue for corporate reorganization under Chapter 11—are temporary.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I thank Ranking Member CONYERS, the bill’s sponsor, for his leadership on this bill, along with Judiciary Committee Chairman GOODLATTE and Subcommittee Chairman MARINO for their support.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2266, the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017.”

H.R. 2266, the “Bankruptcy Judgeship Act of 2017,” would authorize four additional permanent bankruptcy judgeships and convert 14 temporary bankruptcy judgeships to permanent status based on the most recent recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

H.R. 2266 was introduced on May 1, 2017 by Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Jr. (D-MI) together with Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Chair TOM MARINO (R-PA) and Ranking Member DAVID CICALLINE (D-RI) as original cosponsors.

This bipartisan legislation is time-sensitive as the temporary judgeships are due to expire on May 25, 2017. No hearing has been held on this legislation.

A bankruptcy judge may hear and determine all cases arising under the Bankruptcy Code

and certain related proceedings. A district court, however, may withdraw—in whole or in part—any case or proceeding referred to a bankruptcy judge. If designated by the district to exercise such authority, a bankruptcy judge may conduct a jury trial on consent of all the parties.

Currently pending before Congress is H.R. 244, the “Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017,” which extends for one year the temporary judgeships for the District of Delaware (two judgeships), the Southern District of Florida (two judgeships); the Eastern District of Michigan; the District of Puerto Rico; and the Eastern District of Virginia.

In analyzing bankruptcy judgeship needs, the Judicial Conference employs, as a first step, a case weight formula devised by the Federal Judicial Center that is intended to provide a more accurate and useful measure of judicial workload than a mere count of filings does.

Pursuant to Conference policy, “if a district’s annual weighted caseload per authorized judgeship is 1,500 weighted filings or more, the district will receive consideration for an additional judgeship.”

With respect to the Conference’s current request for additional bankruptcy judgeships, the weighted case filings have increased by more than 55 percent for most of these districts since the last time additional judgeships were authorized in 2005, according to the Conference.

In addition, all 14 of the temporary bankruptcy judgeships that the bill converts to permanent status are set to lapse as of May 25, 2017.

To offset the cost of this legislation, H.R. 2266 increases the quarterly fee payable that chapter 11 debtors pay to the United States Trustee System Fund, but only with respect to debtors that have quarterly disbursements in excess of \$1 million dollars during the period when the Fund has less than \$200 million.

This provision is substantively identical to a legislative proposal made by the prior Administration as represented in President Barack Obama’s budget request for 2017.

Taken together, the resulting analysis provides a reliable basis upon which Congress may assess the necessity of authorizing additional judgeships and extending temporary judgeships.

For all of these reasons, I support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2266, 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.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS’ BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 419) to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 419

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 “Public Safety Officers’ Benefits Improvement Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. REPORTS.

Section 1205 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “Rules, regulations, and procedures issued under this part may include regulations based on standards developed by another Federal agency for programs related to public safety officer death or disability claims.” before the last sentence;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” before “In making”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) In making a determination under section 1201, the Bureau shall give substantial weight to the evidence and all findings of fact presented by a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits.

“(3) If the head of a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency, in consultation with the principal legal officer of the agency, provides a certification of facts regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits, the Bureau shall adopt the factual findings, if the factual findings are supported by substantial evidence.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(e)(1)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau information on all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

“(B) Not less frequently than once per week, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau updated information with respect to all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

“(C) The information made available under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) for each pending claim—

“(I) the date on which the claim was submitted to the Bureau;

“(II) the State of residence of the claimant;

“(III) an anonymized, identifying claim number; and

“(IV) the nature of the claim; and

“(ii) the total number of pending claims that were submitted to the Bureau more than 1 year before the date on which the information is made available.

“(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall publish on the public website of the Bureau a report, and shall update such report on such website not less than once every 180 days thereafter, containing—

“(A) the total number of claims for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(B) the amount of time required to process each claim for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(C) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

“(D) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

“(E) for each claim described in subparagraph (D), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

“(F) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination has not been made;

“(G) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination has not been made;

“(H) for each claim described in subparagraph (G), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

“(I) the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau relating to exposure due to the September 11th, 2001, terrorism attacks for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, and the average award amount for any such claims that were approved;

“(J) the result of each claim for which a final determination was made during the 180-day period preceding the report, including the number of claims rejected and the basis for any denial of benefits;

“(K) the number of final determinations which were appealed during the 180-day period preceding the report, regardless of when the final determination was first made;

“(L) the average number of claims processed per reviewer of the Bureau during the 180-day period preceding the report;

“(M) for any claim submitted to the Bureau that required the submission of additional information from a public agency, and for which the public agency completed providing all of the required information during the 180-day period preceding the report, the average length of the period beginning on the date the public agency was contacted by the Bureau and ending on the date on which the public agency submitted all required information to the Bureau;

“(N) for any claim submitted to the Bureau for which the Bureau issued a subpoena to a public agency during the 180-day period preceding the report in order to obtain information or documentation necessary to determine the claim, the name of the public agency, the date on which the subpoena was issued, and the dates on which the public agency was contacted by the Bureau before the issuance of the subpoena; and

“(O) information on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3), including—

“(i) the number of claims that are eligible for compensation under both this part and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 (49 U.S.C. 40101 note; Public Law 107-42) (commonly referred to as the ‘VCF’);

“(ii) for each claim described in clause (i) for which compensation has been paid under the VCF, the amount of compensation paid under the VCF;

“(iii) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has made a final determination; and

“(iv) the number of claims described in clause (i) for which the Bureau has not made a final determination.

“(3) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, and 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(A) conduct a study on the compliance of the Bureau with the obligation to offset award amounts under section 1201(f)(3); and

“(B) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subparagraph (A) that includes an assessment of whether the Bureau has provided the information required under subparagraph (B)(ix) of paragraph (2) of this subsection in each report required under that paragraph.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘nature of the claim’ means whether the claim is a claim for—

“(A) benefits under this subpart with respect to the death of a public safety officer;

“(B) benefits under this subpart with respect to the disability of a public safety officer; or

“(C) education assistance under subpart 2.”

SEC. 3. AGE LIMITATION FOR CHILDREN.

Section 1212(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796d-1(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “No child” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), no child”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DELAYED APPROVALS.—

“(A) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION.—If a claim for assistance under this subpart is approved more than 1 year after the date on which the application for such assistance is filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the application is filed; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the application is approved.

“(B) CLAIM FOR BENEFITS FOR DEATH OR PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY.—In addition to an extension under subparagraph (A), if any, for an application for assistance under this subpart that relates to a claim for benefits under subpart 1 that was approved more than 1 year after the date on which the claim was filed with the Attorney General, the age limitation under this subsection shall be extended by the length of the period—

“(i) beginning on the day after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the claim for benefits is submitted; and

“(ii) ending on the date on which the claim for benefits is approved.”

SEC. 4. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

Subpart 1 of part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1206. DUE DILIGENCE IN PAYING BENEFIT CLAIMS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau, with all due diligence, shall expeditiously attempt to obtain the information and documentation necessary to adjudicate a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2.

“(b) SUFFICIENT INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE.—If a benefit claim filed under this part, including a claim for financial assistance under subpart 2, is unable to be adjudicated by the Bureau because of a lack of information or documentation from a third party, such as a public agency, and such information is not readily available to the claimant, the Bureau may not abandon the benefit claim unless the Bureau has utilized the investigative tools available to the Bureau to obtain the necessary information or documentation, including subpoenas.”

SEC. 5. PRESUMPTION THAT OFFICER ACTED PROPERLY.

Section 1202 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796a) is amended—

(1) by striking “No benefit” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No benefit”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PRESUMPTION.—In determining whether a benefit is payable under this part, the Bureau—

“(1) shall presume that none of the limitations described in subsection (a) apply; and

“(2) shall not determine that a limitation described in subsection (a) applies, absent clear and convincing evidence.”

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall—

(1) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to any benefit claim or application under part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) that is—

(A) pending before the Bureau of Justice Assistance on the date of enactment; or

(B) received by the Bureau on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 419, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1976 Congress passed and the President signed into law the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act. The act was designed to offer peace of mind to men and women seeking careers as public safety officers, namely, that if something happened to them in their dangerous roles, their families would have support.

It shows that America places enormous value on those in our communities who protect and serve, those whose response to danger is to face it head-on and who put others before themselves daily.

The PSOB program, administered by the Department of Justice, provides death benefits in the form of a one-time financial payment to eligible survivors of public safety officers who have died in the line of duty.

The program also provides benefits to public safety officers who are permanently and totally disabled because of injuries sustained in the line of duty.

Finally, the PSOB program provides financial assistance to help pay higher education costs for the spouses and children of public safety officers who have died or been injured in the line of duty.

It is a program that is meant to help the loved ones of fallen officers move forward in the aftermath of tragedies.

Unfortunately, in recent years, the PSOB program has had some incidents of delay, and some families were left in the dark about the status of applications. These families were unable to move forward after their tragic losses, and we recognize that is not acceptable for a family that has sacrificed so much for their communities.

Legislation was introduced in the last Congress, and again this Congress as S. 419, to address these regrettable failings. This bill provides for transparency in the processing of claims in the PSOB program and codifies measures to ensure the system is streamlined and operates in a fair manner.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their work and strong support of these law enforcement families. I would especially like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) for his unwavering support of the families of law enforcement.

In his second inaugural address, President Lincoln reminded the American people: "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." This legislation is designed to do exactly that for the brave men and women in blue who protect and serve all of us every day.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this bill passed the Senate unanimously. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation today.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in strong support of S. 419, the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act, a bill which was just passed by the Senate yesterday.

Each day, public safety officers put their lives on the line for the greater good of those whom they have taken an oath to serve and protect. Unfortunately, for some of these brave men and women, the ultimate sacrifice is made, and they will die while in the line of duty.

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, which is administered by the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Assistance, was established in 1976 to provide certain benefits to the families of these officers as well as to officers who are disabled as a result of their service.

The death benefit is provided to eligible survivors of public safety officers whose deaths are a direct and proximate result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty or death from certain heart attacks, strokes, and vascular ruptures sustained while on duty.

An education benefit is provided to spouses and children of public safety officers killed or disabled while on duty. The program provides disability benefits to officers catastrophically injured in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I support S. 419 because it will significantly improve in several respects how benefits claims of fallen and injured officers are processed under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program. To begin with, the bill responds to the fact that, all too often, these officers and their families, after experiencing a loss of life or traumatic injury, must then endure months, sometimes years, of uncertainty and delay concerning their benefit claims.

S. 419 requires the Bureau to give substantial weight to evidence and facts presented by a Federal, State, or local agency when determining eligibility for death or disability benefits. In addition, the measure authorizes the Bureau of Justice Assistance to establish rules based on standards for the Benefits program. These two requirements will help facilitate and expedite the Benefits program claims processed and, thereby, reduce the backlog of families awaiting a decision on their benefit claims.

S. 419 also increases transparency of the Bureau's claims processing. It requires, for example, the Bureau to publish and update a report with information on the status of pending claims regarding death, disability, and educational claims submitted, which will increase transparency.

As we all know, transparency often leads to accountability, and this bill will make the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Department of Justice more accountable to the families of fallen and traumatically injured officers, Congress, and the public as well. By requiring that updates or pending benefit claims be posted on public websites, Congress and the public will be able to evaluate the performance of the Bureau in timely processing pending claims.

Finally, S. 419 will help ensure that families, who are the ultimate victims of those who sacrifice their lives for our protection, are not deprived of benefits they are due under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program.

We all have a responsibility to take care of surviving family members when a first responder is tragically killed or injured in the line of duty. This bill is a step in the right direction of ensuring that families are not overly burdened and that the public is aware of how the Bureau and the Justice Department are handling claims submitted by family members.

Mr. Speaker, the sacrifice of these first responders should not be taken for granted, and their families should not be unduly burdened when applying for benefits under the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program. Accordingly, I support S. 419. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly significant to note that S. 419 is being considered in the midst of National Police Week, a period dedicated to honor our Nation's fallen law enforcement heroes.

President John Kennedy, by proclamation signed in 1962, designated May

15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that date falls as National Police Week.

S. 419 memorializes our commitment to public safety officers, who daily risk their lives for us, by removing barriers that prevent beneficiaries under the Benefits program from obtaining the benefits they so justly deserve. Families of our first responders deserve timely consideration of benefit claims when their loved ones give the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure so that it may be sent to the President for signature.

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

□ 1430

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time only to say that I very much appreciate the work on both sides of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Michigan.

This is a good, bipartisan bill which should be passed today. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 419, the "Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act of 2017".

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits program or PSOB Program provides death, disability, and education benefits to public safety officers and their survivors.

The PSOB Program is administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, or BJA, which is a component of the Department of Justice.

Under the Program, the death benefit is provided to eligible survivors of public safety officers whose death was a direct and proximate result of a traumatic injury sustained in the line of duty or certain work-related heart attacks or strokes.

The Program provides a disability benefit to public safety officers who have been permanently and totally disabled as the direct and proximate result of a catastrophic injury sustained in the line of duty, if that injury permanently prevents the officer from performing any gainful employment.

The education benefit provides assistance to spouses and children of public safety officers killed or disabled in the line of duty who attend an educational program at an eligible education institution.

All too often, these first responders and their families needlessly suffer months and years of uncertainty after experiencing a loss of life or a traumatic injury.

This bill is a show of appreciation for the brave men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice while serving in the line of duty as well as an expression of appreciation and support to the families of these first responders.

S. 419 improves how the Department of Justice processes claims under the PSOB Program.

The measure authorizes the Bureau of Justice Assistance to establish rules based on standards for the PSOB Program and it requires the Bureau of Justice Assistance to give substantial weight to evidence and facts

presented by a federal, state, or local agency when determining eligibility for death or disability benefits.

These two requirements will decrease the time in which claims are processed, thereby reducing the backlog of families awaiting a decision on their benefits claim.

S. 419 also increases the level of transparency regarding claims processed by requiring the Bureau of Justice Assistance to publish and update information on the status of pending claims.

By requiring that updates on pending benefits claims be posted on public websites, the public will be able to evaluate the performance of the Bureau of Justice Assistance in timely processing claims.

As we honor our fallen heroes this week during National Police Week, I think now is as greater a time as any to ensure that we remove barriers that hinder their families from obtaining benefits we promised them when we enacted the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Act.

Accordingly, I strongly support S. 419.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 419.

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.

THOMASINA E. JORDAN INDIAN TRIBES OF VIRGINIA FEDERAL RECOGNITION ACT OF 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 984) to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 984

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 “Thomasina E. Jordan Indian Tribes of Virginia Federal Recognition Act of 2017”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

- Sec. 101. Findings.
- Sec. 102. Definitions.
- Sec. 103. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 104. Membership; governing documents.
- Sec. 105. Governing body.
- Sec. 106. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 107. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE II—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE—EASTERN DIVISION

- Sec. 201. Findings.
- Sec. 202. Definitions.
- Sec. 203. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 204. Membership; governing documents.

- Sec. 205. Governing body.
- Sec. 206. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 207. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE III—UPPER MATTAPONI TRIBE

- Sec. 301. Findings.
- Sec. 302. Definitions.
- Sec. 303. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 304. Membership; governing documents.
- Sec. 305. Governing body.
- Sec. 306. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 307. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE IV—RAPPAHANNOCK TRIBE, INC.

- Sec. 401. Findings.
- Sec. 402. Definitions.
- Sec. 403. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 404. Membership; governing documents.
- Sec. 405. Governing body.
- Sec. 406. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 407. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE V—MONACAN INDIAN NATION

- Sec. 501. Findings.
- Sec. 502. Definitions.
- Sec. 503. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 504. Membership; governing documents.
- Sec. 505. Governing body.
- Sec. 506. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 507. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VI—NANSEMOND INDIAN TRIBE

- Sec. 601. Findings.
- Sec. 602. Definitions.
- Sec. 603. Federal recognition.
- Sec. 604. Membership; governing documents.
- Sec. 605. Governing body.
- Sec. 606. Reservation of the Tribe.
- Sec. 607. Hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, and water rights.

TITLE VII—EMINENT DOMAIN

- Sec. 701. Limitation.
- SEC. 2. INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT OF 1978.**
Nothing in this Act affects the application of section 109 of the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1919).

TITLE I—CHICKAHOMINY INDIAN TRIBE

- SEC. 101. FINDINGS.**
Congress finds that—
- (1) in 1607, when the English settlers set shore along the Virginia coastline, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe was one of about 30 tribes that received them;
 - (2) in 1614, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe entered into a treaty with Sir Thomas Dale, Governor of the Jamestown Colony, under which—
 - (A) the Chickahominy Indian Tribe agreed to provide 2 bushels of corn per man and send warriors to protect the English; and
 - (B) Sir Thomas Dale agreed in return to allow the Tribe to continue to practice its own tribal governance;
 - (3) in 1646, a treaty was signed which forced the Chickahominy from their homeland to the area around the York Mattaponi River in present-day King William County, leading to the formation of a reservation;
 - (4) in 1677, following Bacon's Rebellion, the Queen of Pamunkey signed the Treaty of Middle Plantation on behalf of the Chickahominy;
 - (5) in 1702, the Chickahominy were forced from their reservation, which caused the loss of a land base;
 - (6) in 1711, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg established a grammar school for Indians called Brafferton College;
 - (7) a Chickahominy child was one of the first Indians to attend Brafferton College;
 - (8) in 1750, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to migrate from King William County back to the area around the Chickahominy River in New Kent and Charles City Counties;

(9) in 1793, a Baptist missionary named Bradby took refuge with the Chickahominy and took a Chickahominy woman as his wife;

(10) in 1831, the names of the ancestors of the modern-day Chickahominy Indian Tribe began to appear in the Charles City County census records;

(11) in 1901, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe formed Samaria Baptist Church;

(12) from 1901 to 1935, Chickahominy men were assessed a tribal tax so that their children could receive an education;

(13) the Tribe used the proceeds from the tax to build the first Samaria Indian School, buy supplies, and pay a teacher's salary;

(14) in 1919, C. Lee Moore, Auditor of Public Accounts for Virginia, told Chickahominy Chief O.W. Adkins that he had instructed the Commissioner of Revenue for Charles City County to record Chickahominy tribal members on the county tax rolls as Indian, and not as White or colored;

(15) during the period of 1920 through 1930, various Governors of the Commonwealth of Virginia wrote letters of introduction for Chickahominy Chiefs who had official business with Federal agencies in Washington, DC;

(16) in 1934, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, requesting money to acquire land for the Chickahominy Indian Tribe's use, to build school, medical, and library facilities and to buy tractors, implements, and seed;

(17) in 1934, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, wrote to Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins, informing him that Congress had passed the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Indian Reorganization Act”) (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), but had not made the appropriation to fund the Act;

(18) in 1942, Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins wrote to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for help in getting the proper racial designation on Selective Service records for Chickahominy soldiers;

(19) in 1943, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asked Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News-Leader newspaper of Richmond, Virginia, to help Virginia Indians obtain proper racial designation on birth records;

(20) Collier stated that his office could not officially intervene because it had no responsibility for the Virginia Indians, “as a matter largely of historical accident”, but was “interested in them as descendants of the original inhabitants of the region”;

(21) in 1948, the Veterans' Education Committee of the Virginia State Board of Education approved Samaria Indian School to provide training to veterans;

(22) that school was established and run by the Chickahominy Indian Tribe;

(23) in 1950, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe purchased and donated to the Charles City County School Board land to be used to build a modern school for students of the Chickahominy and other Virginia Indian tribes;

(24) the Samaria Indian School included students in grades 1 through 8;

(25) in 1961, Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, requested Chickahominy Chief O.O. Adkins to provide assistance in analyzing the status of the constitutional rights of Indians “in your area”;

(26) in 1967, the Charles City County school board closed Samaria Indian School and converted the school to a countywide primary school as a step toward full school integration of Indian and non-Indian students;

(27) in 1972, the Charles City County school board began receiving funds under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) on behalf of