

meantime, we should pass this bill, we should get about the business of putting Americans to work—the first Americans—and certainly Americans on Indian reservations that have every obstacle in the world against them. This bill will give one more tool in the toolbox. It's not a panacea, but it's a tool they ought to have.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to inquire if the other side has any additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend I have no more requests for time, and I am prepared to close if the gentleman is.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, then, at this time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Native American Caucus and co-sponsor, I rise today in support of H.R. 2362, "The Indian Tribal Trade and Investment Demonstrations Project Act of 2011." This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to select up to six Indian tribes or consortia of Indian tribes to participate in an Indian Tribal Trade and Investment Demonstration Project that facilitates trade and financial investment in Indian tribal economies by private entities from Turkey.

Tribes selected for the program are to develop their own guidelines for leasing land and services to both foreign and domestic companies for economic development purposes. This act requires that the Secretary of Interior approve land leasing guidelines only once, reducing current multi-layer prohibitive land leasing laws. H.R. 2362 is a demonstration project, and if successful it would be expanded. This bill has been amended to expand the period of the demonstration project from one to three years to allow reasonable time for Tribes to draft leasing regulations, attain approval by the Secretary of Interior, and enter into a lease.

Economic development on tribal lands is hampered by a restrictive and archaic leasing system that requires applications to go through multiple levels of review and can sometimes take up to six years. Examples of projects delayed by this application process: Round Valley Indian Housing Authority has been waiting for nine years for BIA to process a lease for a large housing project. In 2006, the Swinomish made a deal with Wal-Mart to build a store on the reservation. The BIA regional office sat on the lease for two years and Wal-Mart pulled out of the deal after the 2008 financial crisis.

During a hearing on the bill held in the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs, a tribal witness explained that Turkey has a long track record of promoting good relations and trade between its private business community and Indian tribes in the United States. The intent of the bill is to further such relations to increase private business development in Indian Country where economic diversification is greatly needed. This bill also allows all 155 members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) an equal opportunity to invest in Indian tribal economies.

Mr. Speaker, the major purpose and dominant aim of this bill is to promote economic

development is Indian Country and not to reward or show favoritism to Turkey. The reason Turkey is directly recognized in this legislation is to acknowledge its helpful role in developing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, Native Americans suffer from the highest unemployment and social illness rates reported in the United States. This legislation will be the first step to ameliorating those ailments and begin to diversify Indian Country.

That is why this legislation is strongly supported by the National Congress of American Indians and the National American Indian Housing Council two of the nation's leading advocacy organizations on behalf of Native Americans. I will continue support legislation that invests in our economy and our Indian tribes. I urge my colleagues to support this demonstration so that we can expand this much needed project.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing in H.R. 2362 can't be accomplished by H.R. 205, the HEARTH Act, which passed the House unanimously in May and was just last week passed by the Senate without change. The President is expected to sign H.R. 205 into law any day now.

Unlike H.R. 2362, the HEARTH Act authorizes all tribes to engage in leasing activities with any nation—foreign or domestic—for economic development purposes on tribal lands. It does not discriminate based on world geography, or benefit a select few tribes who qualify under strict requirements for a time-limited demonstration project.

In light of H.R. 205, there is simply no need for H.R. 2362. It is redundant and unnecessary and should be rejected by the House on this basis alone.

But there are serious reasons to oppose H.R. 2362.

By acknowledging Turkey's "unique interest" in developing tribal economies and in building "robust" relationships between it and tribal communities, this legislation rewards a country with a terrible history of human rights and religious freedom violations, threats to U.S. commercial interests in Cyprus, and—most importantly—its refusal to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide which resulted in the deaths of 1.5 million people.

The manager's amendment to include WTO countries does not change the fact that Turkey is singled out for preferential treatment and will benefit through increased investment opportunities in Indian country.

Congress should not be in the business of rewarding countries with appalling records on human rights to develop economic ties to Indian country on a preferential basis.

I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2362, 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. SARBANES. 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.

□ 1640

BRIDGEPORT INDIAN COLONY LAND TRUST, HEALTH, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2012

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2467) to take certain Federal lands in Mono County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2467

*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 "Bridgeport Indian Colony Land Trust, Health, and Economic Development Act of 2012".

**SEC. 2. LANDS TO BE TAKEN INTO TRUST.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and management agreements related to easements and rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest (including improvements and appurtenances) of the United States in and to the Federal lands described in subsection (b) are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony, except that the oversight and renewal of all easements and rights-of-way with the Bridgeport Public Utility District in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act shall remain the responsibility of the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) FEDERAL LANDS DESCRIBED.—The Federal lands referred to in subsection (a) are the approximately 39.36 acres described as follows:

(1) The South half of the South half of the Northwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter and the North half of the Southwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 21, Township 8 North, Range 23 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, containing 7.5 acres, more or less, as identified on the map titled "Bridgeport Camp Antelope Parcel" and dated July 26, 2010.

(2) Lots 1 and 2 of the Bureau of Land Management survey plat entitled "Dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivision of Section 28, designed to restore the corners in their true original locations according to the best available evidence, and the further subdivision of Section 28 and the metes and bounds survey of a portion of the right-of-way of California State Highway No. 182, Township 5 North, Range 25 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, California" and dated February 21, 2003 containing 31.86 acres, more or less.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The maps referred to in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection at the office of the California State Director, Bureau of Land Management.

(d) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under this section shall not be eligible for, or considered to have been taken into trust for, class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2467, which is sponsored by our colleague from California (Mr. MCKEON), places two parcels of land in trust for a tribe in his district known as the Bridgeport Indian Colony. This is a small tribe located in a fairly remote area in eastern California.

The two parcels are approximately 40 acres of public land currently administered by the Bureau of Land Management. One parcel is a 32-acre tract located along Highway 182, adjacent to the tribe's existing reservation. The tribe states that it intends to use the lands for housing and related community development because its existing reservation is running out of room for additional uses.

The other parcel is a 7.5-acre tract located 30 miles off the tribe's reservation. The tribe originally leased this property from the Bureau of Land Management for a health clinic which closed several years ago. The tribe still owns the building and has expressed its intent to reopen the clinic, but without ownership of the property in trust it is unlikely this purpose can be achieved.

Hearings were held on a similar bill in the last Congress, and the Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing this year. The Department of the Interior has not expressed reservations with holding these public lands in trust for the tribe, nor has it requested the tribe to pay for the public land.

Though the committee has heard no opposition to the bill, the local public utility district serving the city of Bridgeport requested language to clarify that existing easements serving the district's customers remain the responsibility of the BLM. The bill's sponsor, Mr. MCKEON, worked out language, after consulting with all affected parties, to ensure this request was appropriately handled for the benefit of the town and of the tribe.

I want to point out that while the bill was reported by the Natural Resources Committee without objection from its members, it lacked language addressing potential tribal gambling rights on the new trust land. Because the expansion of gambling under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act may cause concern among many Members in the House, and because the primary purpose of the lands, as explained by the tribe, is not for operating a casino, the text of the bill before us today includes new language prohibiting class

II and class III gaming on the public lands.

With that, the bill is a good bill, and I urge its passage. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2467 would transfer two parcels of Federal land into trust for the exclusive benefit of the Bridgeport Indian Colony, a Federally recognized Indian tribe located in rural Mono County, California.

The tribe seeks to expand its reservation in order to address its additional housing and community development needs, as well as to address its need for a local community health services clinic that will service Indian and non-Indians in the area.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2467, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the author of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 2467, the Bridgeport Indian Colony Land Trust, Health, and Economic Development Act of 2012. I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY, as well as subcommittee Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member LUJÁN, for giving my legislation a fair hearing and moving the bill through the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Bridgeport Indian Colony is a Federally recognized Indian tribe with a reservation located near the town of Bridgeport in Mono County, California. The tribe's reservation is approximately 40 acres and was established by Federal law in 1974. However, the size of the current reservation is insufficient for the tribe's housing and community development needs.

In order to create space for economic development and housing, my legislation proposes to transfer from the BLM to the BIA to hold in trust for the tribe one parcel of land contiguous to the tribe's existing reservation, totaling approximately 31 acres. On this parcel, the tribe plans to construct an RV park, gas station, convenience store, and residential housing for tribal members, as well as a recreational center to serve the greater community.

Mr. Speaker, many tribal members have expressed interest in moving back to the reservation if housing and job opportunities can be made available. And this bill will create jobs in a part of my district where unemployment is over 10 percent.

Additionally, my legislation would promote the health care of the tribe and community by taking into trust a 7-acre BLM parcel where the Toiyabe Indian Health Project previously served the community, allowing the clinic to be reopened and returned to

service. Currently, members of the tribe have to drive 90 miles to Bishop to obtain health care services.

In the 1980s, the tribe applied for and received a community development block grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to build a health care facility in Mono County. With Toiyabe Indian Health Project directing the project, the Camp Antelope Health Clinic was built on a 7.16-acre parcel of Federal land one mile north of Walker, California, approximately 30 miles from the tribe's reservation—60 miles closer than the Bishop health clinic. Unfortunately, the Toiyabe Indian Health Project closed the Camp Antelope Health Clinic in 2006.

The tribe and the Toiyabe Indian Health Project have agreed that the health clinic needs to be reopened, and the investment of the Federal funds in the development of the health clinic from the CDBG grant adds to the importance of maintaining the parcel under Federal ownership.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the process of developing this legislation, I worked closely with the tribe and the Bridgeport Public Utility District to mitigate any concerns that the utility district had regarding the rights of way of an easement which crosses the first parcel proposed for transfer from the BLM to the BIA in trust to the tribe. The services provided by the utility district, both to the community of Bridgeport as well as to the tribe, depend on the infrastructure where this easement is located. Currently, the easement is managed by the BLM and is subject to periodic renewal. I clarified in my legislation that this easement should continue to be managed by the BLM, as this has proven successful.

The Mono County Board of Supervisors voted to support the land transfer in October of 2009 and agreed unanimously in April of 2010 to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the tribe, thus supporting the tribe's efforts to have these parcels of land transferred into trust. Additionally, there is language contained in my bill that clarifies that there will be no new gaming on lands that are acquired by the tribe.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving my bill time on the floor. The additional land will be greatly beneficial to the Bridgeport Indian Tribe, and I urge Members to support this vital legislation.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there are additional speakers on the other side?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend I have no requests for time, and I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman is.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, we also urge the support and passage of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation; I urge its passage. And I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2467, 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.

□ 1650

**REPEAL OF PROVISION RELATING TO MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE COST REPORTING**

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5859) to repeal an obsolete provision in title 49, United States Code, requiring motor vehicle insurance cost reporting, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5859

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

**SECTION 1. REPEAL.**

*Subsection (c) of section 32302 of title 49, United States Code, is repealed, and any regulations promulgated under such subsection shall have no force or effect.*

**SEC. 2. DETERMINATION REGARDING PROVISION OF DAMAGE SUSCEPTIBILITY INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS.**

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32302(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary, after providing an opportunity for public comment, shall study and report to Congress the most useful data, format, and method for providing simple and understandable damage susceptibility information to consumers.”*

*(b) DEADLINE.—The Secretary of Transportation shall carry out the last sentence of section 32302(b) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mrs. BONO MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on H.R. 5859.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BONO MACK. Today, we have an opportunity to slam the car door on an obsolete provision in the United States Code requiring motor vehicle insurance cost reporting, which is of little or no use to American consumers.

I want to commend Mr. HARPER of Mississippi and Mr. OWENS of New York for their bipartisan work on H.R. 5859, as well as Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for their leadership in moving this legislation forward. I also want to thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, our subcommittee's ranking member, for his help with our efforts to repeal this costly and outdated provision of the law.

Additionally, just this morning, I received word that the five leading automotive trade associations in the U.S., including the National Automobile Dealers Association, are all supportive of H.R. 5859, and here's why.

In 1993, NHTSA issued a final rule requiring new-car dealers to make available to buyers a booklet containing the latest information on insurance costs. The information is updated by NHTSA annually, based on data from the Highway Loss Data Institute.

The information required by this regulation is rarely sought by consumers and its value is highly questionable. Insurance premiums are based primarily on factors that are unrelated to the susceptibility of damage to a vehicle, including the driver's age, driving record, location, and miles driven.

Additionally, a recent survey of 850 members of the National Automobile Dealers Association reported 96 percent of its dealers have never been asked by a customer—not even once—to see the insurance cost booklet that is at issue here today.

Clearly, this is yet another example of where the cost of a Federal regulation outweighs its potential benefit. As a nation, we simply cannot afford to keep doing business that way. And frankly, the current law has more problems than an old, dirty, oil-burning engine.

Today, new-car dealers face civil penalties if they do not provide, upon request, the booklet that discloses the relative cost to repair vehicles after a collision, yet the data is completely generic and skewed by averaging the repair costs of everything from fender-benders to vehicle rollovers. How is this useful information to consumers at the point of sale?

Even more troubling, this information is not always accurate or up to date. For the most part, it is simply a compilation of historical information and does not take into account new model year changes that can significantly alter how a car performs in a crash.

And finally, even the administration suggests this requirement should be eliminated. In technical comments provided earlier this year to Congress, NHTSA describes the data as, and I'm quoting now:

rarely used and not useful because the differences in rates due to loss payments are overshadowed by differences in premiums due to driver demographics, geographic location, and the relative prices of the vehicles.

In other words, the requirement is simply not working as intended, and

it's become a needless cost and burden to automobile dealers nationwide.

Today, we have an opportunity to tow this clunker of a regulation to the junkyard where it belongs and to provide America's nearly 20,000 automobile dealers with some important regulatory relief.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5859 repeals a provision of law related to the reporting of automobile insurance cost. This provision requires car dealers to make available to prospective buyers information that compares insurance costs for different vehicles based on damage susceptibility.

While I am always wary of any attempts to limit consumer information, clearly, the provision of law that H.R. 5859 would repeal is simply not working as intended.

Every year, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, or NHTSA, as we call it, produces and sends to auto dealers a booklet containing insurance cost information. Dealers have told us that very few consumers even ask for the booklet. Yet, under Federal law, NHTSA is still required to produce and distribute these booklets, and dealers are still required to make them available.

I am not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to ending the current reporting mandate. However, we should not repeal this mandate without acknowledging that the impetus behind the original provision is sound. The purpose of the provision was to give consumers a basis for comparing damageability risk at the point of sale.

Damageability is about how much damage a car is likely to sustain when a collision occurs, even at very low speed. The law also intended to create an incentive for manufacturers to produce cars which are more resistant to damage and less expensive to repair and service.

Whether you think the current requirement is a nuisance for auto dealers or you think that NHTSA has missed the mark in its implementation of the mandate, I think we should accept that consumers continue to have a legitimate interest in minimizing the costs associated with minor collisions.

Therefore, I would like to thank Congressman HARPER for his interest in this; Congressman OWENS, on our side of the aisle, from New York, who was one of the original Members of Congress who presented this idea; Chairman BONO MACK and Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member WAXMAN for all working with me to include alongside the repeal a requirement that NHTSA thoroughly examine—that would be the requirement—that NHTSA would thoroughly reexamine the issue of how best to inform prospective buyers about damage susceptibility.

I think we have struck the right balance. We fix a valid problem and keep in place a valuable principle.