

Davis (AL) Kanjorski Oberstar
 Davis (CA) Kaptur Obey
 Davis (IL) Kennedy Olson
 Davis (KY) Kildee Olver
 Davis (TN) Kilpatrick (MI) Ortiz
 Deal (GA) Kilroy Pallone
 DeFazio Kind Pascrell
 DeGette King (IA) Pastor (AZ)
 DeLauro King (NY) Paulsen
 Dent Kingston Payne
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kirk Pence
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kirkpatrick (AZ) Perlmutter
 Dicks Kissell Perriello
 Dingell Klein (FL) Peters
 Doggett Kline (MN) Peterson
 Donnelly (IN) Kosmas Petri
 Dreier Kratovil Pingree (ME)
 Driehaus Kucinich Pitts
 Duncan Lamborn Platts
 Edwards (MD) Lance Polis (CO)
 Edwards (TX) Langevin Pomeroy
 Ehlers Larsen (WA) Posey
 Ellison Larson (CT) Price (GA)
 Ellsworth Latham Price (NC)
 Emerson LaTourette Putnam
 Engel Latta Quigley
 Eshoo Lee (CA) Rahall
 Etheridge Lee (NY) Rangel
 Fallon Levin Rehberg
 Farr Lewis (CA) Reichert
 Fattah Lewis (GA) Reyes
 Filner Linder Richardson
 Fleming Lipinski Rodriguez
 Fortenberry LoBiondo Roe (TN)
 Foster Loeb sack Rogers (AL)
 Foxx Lofgren, Zoe Rogers (KY)
 Frank (MA) Lowey Rogers (MI)
 Franks (AZ) Lucas Rohrabacher
 Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer Rooney
 Fudge Luján Roskam
 Gallegly Lummis Ross
 Garrett (NJ) Lungren, Daniel Rothman (NJ)
 Gerlach E. Roybal-Allard
 Giffords Lynch Royce
 Gingrey (GA) Mack Ruppertsberger
 Gohmert Maffei Rush
 Gonzalez Maloney Ryan (OH)
 Goodlatte Manzullo Ryan (WI)
 Gordon (TN) Marchant Salazar
 Granger Markey (CO) Sánchez, Linda
 Graves Markey (MA) T.
 Grayson Marshall Sanchez, Loretta
 Green, Al Massa Sarbanes
 Green, Gene Matheson Scalise
 Griffith Matsui Schakowsky
 Grijalva McCarthy (CA) Schauer
 Guthrie McCarthy (NY) Schiff
 Gutierrez McCaul Schmidt
 Hall (NY) McClintock Schock
 Hall (TX) McCollum Schrader
 Halvorson McCotter Schwartz
 Hare McDermott Scott (GA)
 Harman McGovern Scott (VA)
 Harper McHenry Sensenbrenner
 Hastings (FL) McIntyre Serrano
 Hastings (WA) McKeon Sessions
 Heinrich McMahon Sestak
 Heller McMorris Shea-Porter
 Hensarling Rodgers Sherman
 Hergert McNeerney Shimkus
 Herseht Sandlin Meek (FL) Shuler
 Higgins Meeks (NY) Shuster
 Hill Melancon Simpson
 Himes Mica Sires
 Hinchey Michaud Skelton
 Hinojosa Miller (FL) Slaughter
 Hirono Miller (MI) Smith (NE)
 Hodes Miller (NC) Smith (TX)
 Hoekstra Miller, Gary Smith (WA)
 Holden Miller, George Snyder
 Holt Minnick Souder
 Honda Mitchell Space
 Hoyer Mollohan Mollohan
 Hunter Moore (KS) Spratt
 Inglis Moore (WI) Stark
 Inslee Moran (KS) Stearns
 Israel Moran (VA) Stupak
 Issa Murphy (CT) Sullivan
 Jackson (IL) Murphy (NY) Sutton
 Jackson-Lee (TX) Murphy, Patrick Tanner
 Jenkins Murphy, Tim Taylor
 Johnson (GA) Murtha Teague
 Johnson (IL) Myrick Terry
 Johnson, E.B. Nadler (NY) Thompson (CA)
 Johnson, Sam Napolitano Thompson (MS)
 Jones Neal (MA) Thompson (PA)
 Neugebauer Thornberry
 Jordan (OH) Nunes Tiahrt
 Kagen Nye Tiberi

Tierney Walz Wexler
 Titus Wamp Whitfield
 Tonko Wasserman Wilson (OH)
 Towns Schultz Wilson (SC)
 Tsongas Waters Wittman
 Turner Watson Wolf
 Upton Watt Woolsey
 Van Hollen Waxman Wu
 Velázquez Weiner Yarmuth
 Visclosky Welch Young (AK)
 Walden Westmoreland Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Flake Paul
 NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie Delahunt Ros-Lehtinen
 Barrett (SC) Doyle Shadegg
 Becerra Forbes Smith (NJ)
 Capuano Poe (TX)
 Chandler Radanovich

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1416

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 726, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I missed rollcall vote nos. 720–726. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on all rollcall votes.

SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 760, I call up the bill (H.R. 324) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Pursuant to House Resolution 760, the amendment printed in House Report 111–263 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 324

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 “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area Act”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Purposes.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Designation of Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

Sec. 5. Management plan.

Sec. 6. Evaluation; report.

Sec. 7. Local coordinating entity.

Sec. 8. Relationship to other Federal agencies.

Sec. 9. Private property and regulatory protections.

Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 11. Use of Federal funds from other sources.

Sec. 12. Sunset for grants and other assistance.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act include—

(1) to establish the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Arizona;

(2) to implement the recommendations of the “Alternative Concepts for Commemorating Spanish Colonization” study completed by the National Park Service in 1991, and the “Feasibility Study for the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area” prepared by the Center for Desert Archaeology in July 2005;

(3) to provide a management framework to foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the region and to conserve the region’s heritage while continuing to pursue compatible economic opportunities;

(4) to assist communities, organizations, and citizens in the State of Arizona in identifying, preserving, interpreting, and developing the historical, cultural, scenic, and natural resources of the region for the educational and inspirational benefit of current and future generations; and

(5) to provide appropriate linkages between units of the National Park System and communities, governments, and organizations within the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.—The term “National Heritage Area” means the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area established in this Act.

(2) LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.—The term “local coordinating entity” means the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., which is hereby designated by Congress—

(A) to develop, in partnership with others, the management plan for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) to act as a catalyst for the implementation of projects and programs among diverse partners in the National Heritage Area.

(3) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term “management plan” means the plan prepared by the local coordinating entity for the National Heritage Area that specifies actions, policies, strategies, performance goals, and recommendations to meet the goals of the National Heritage Area, in accordance with this Act.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF SANTA CRUZ VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The National Heritage Area shall consist of portions of the counties of Santa Cruz and Pima.

(2) MAP.—The boundaries of the National Heritage Area shall be as generally depicted on the map titled “Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area”, and numbered T09/80,000, and dated November 13, 2007. The map shall be on file and available to the public in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the local coordinating entity.

SEC. 5. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The management plan for the National Heritage Area shall—

(1) describe comprehensive policies, goals, strategies, and recommendations for telling the story of the heritage of the area covered

by the National Heritage Area and encouraging long-term resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development of the National Heritage Area;

(2) include a description of actions and commitments that Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, private organizations, and citizens will take to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(3) specify existing and potential sources of funding or economic development strategies to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the National Heritage Area;

(4) include an inventory of the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area related to the national importance and themes of the National Heritage Area that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, funded, and developed;

(5) recommend policies and strategies for resource management, including the development of intergovernmental and inter-agency agreements to protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(6) describe a program for implementation for the management plan, including—

(A) performance goals;

(B) plans for resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development; and

(C) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the local coordinating entity or any Federal, State, Tribal, or local government agency, organization, business, or individual;

(7) include an analysis of, and recommendations for, means by which Federal, State, Tribal, and local programs may best be coordinated (including the role of the National Park Service and other Federal agencies associated with the National Heritage Area) to further the purposes of this Act; and

(8) include a business plan that—

(A) describes the role, operation, financing, and functions of the local coordinating entity and of each of the major activities contained in the management plan; and

(B) provides adequate assurances that the local coordinating entity has the partnerships and financial and other resources necessary to implement the management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(b) DEADLINE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to develop the management plan after designation as a National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval.

(2) TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—If the management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (1), the local coordinating entity shall not qualify for any additional financial assistance under this Act until such time as the management plan is submitted to and approved by the Secretary.

(c) APPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after receiving the plan, the Secretary shall review and approve or disapprove the management plan for a National Heritage Area on the basis of the criteria established under paragraph (3).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Governor of each State in which the National Heritage Area is located before approving a management plan for the National Heritage Area.

(3) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—In determining whether to approve a management plan for a National Heritage Area, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(A) the local coordinating entity represents the diverse interests of the National Heritage Area, including Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners;

(B) the local coordinating entity—

(i) has afforded adequate opportunity for public and Federal, State, Tribal, and local governmental involvement (including through workshops and hearings) in the preparation of the management plan; and

(ii) provides for at least semiannual public meetings to ensure adequate implementation of the management plan;

(C) the resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development strategies described in the management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect, enhance, interpret, fund, manage, and develop the natural, historic, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area;

(D) the management plan would not adversely affect any activities authorized on Federal land under public land laws or land use plans;

(E) the local coordinating entity has demonstrated the financial capability, in partnership with others, to carry out the plan;

(F) the Secretary has received adequate assurances from the appropriate State, Tribal, and local officials whose support is needed to ensure the effective implementation of the State, Tribal, and local elements of the management plan; and

(G) the management plan demonstrates partnerships among the local coordinating entity, Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments, regional planning organizations, nonprofit organizations, or private sector parties for implementation of the management plan.

(4) DISAPPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan, the Secretary—

(i) shall advise the local coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval; and

(ii) may make recommendations to the local coordinating entity for revisions to the management plan.

(B) DEADLINE.—Not later than 180 days after receiving a revised management plan, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the revised management plan.

(5) AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An amendment to the management plan that substantially alters the purposes of the National Heritage Area shall be reviewed by the Secretary and approved or disapproved in the same manner as the original management plan.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION.—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to implement an amendment to the management plan until the Secretary approves the amendment.

(6) AUTHORITIES.—The Secretary may—

(A) provide technical assistance under the authority of this Act for the development and implementation of the management plan; and

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with interested parties to carry out this Act.

SEC. 6. EVALUATION; REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the National Heritage Area under this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the National Heritage Area; and

(2) prepare a report in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) EVALUATION.—An evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1) shall—

(1) assess the progress of the local coordinating entity with respect to—

(A) accomplishing the purposes of the authorizing legislation for the National Heritage Area; and

(B) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area;

(2) analyze the Federal, State, Tribal, and local, and private investments in the National Heritage Area to determine the impact of the investments; and

(3) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the National Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the National Heritage Area.

(c) REPORT.—Based on the evaluation conducted under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. The report shall include recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the National Heritage Area.

SEC. 7. LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.

(a) DUTIES.—To further the purposes of the National Heritage Area, the Santa Cruz Valley Heritage Alliance, Inc., as the local coordinating entity, shall—

(1) prepare a management plan for the National Heritage Area, and submit the management plan to the Secretary, in accordance with this Act;

(2) submit an annual report to the Secretary for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, specifying—

(A) the specific performance goals and accomplishments of the local coordinating entity;

(B) the expenses and income of the local coordinating entity;

(C) the amounts and sources of matching funds;

(D) the amounts leveraged with Federal funds and sources of the leveraging; and

(E) grants made to any other entities during the fiscal year;

(3) make available for audit for each fiscal year for which the local coordinating entity receives Federal funds under this Act, all information pertaining to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds; and

(4) encourage economic viability and sustainability that is consistent with the purposes of the National Heritage Area.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—For the purposes of preparing and implementing the approved management plan for the National Heritage Area, the local coordinating entity may use Federal funds made available under this Act to—

(1) make grants to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, and other parties within the National Heritage Area;

(2) enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to political jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, Federal agencies, and other interested parties;

(3) hire and compensate staff, including individuals with expertise in—

(A) natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resource conservation;

(B) economic and community development; and

(C) heritage planning;

(4) obtain funds or services from any source, including other Federal programs;

(5) contract for goods or services; and

(6) support activities of partners and any other activities that further the purposes of the National Heritage Area and are consistent with the approved management plan.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—The local coordinating entity may not use Federal funds authorized under this Act to acquire any interest in real property.

SEC. 8. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(b) **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.**—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on a National Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the local coordinating entity to the maximum extent practicable.

(c) **OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(2) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of a National Heritage Area;

(3) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized use of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency; or

(4) modifies, alters, or amends any border enforcement authority.

SEC. 9. PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the National Heritage Area;

(2) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, Tribal, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, Tribal, or local law;

(3) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to any local coordinating entity, including but not necessarily limited to development and management of energy, water, or water-related infrastructure;

(4) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(5) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the National Heritage Area; or

(6) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act not more than \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Funds so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

(b) **LIMITATION ON TOTAL AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED.**—Not more than \$15,000,000 may be appropriated to carry out this Act.

(c) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be not more than 50 per-

cent; the non-Federal contribution may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services fairly valued.

SEC. 11. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude the local coordinating entity from using Federal funds available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized.

SEC. 12. SUNSET FOR GRANTS AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.

The authority of the Secretary to provide financial assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 324.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 324, legislation I was proud to introduce earlier this year along with my friend and colleague Representative GIFFORDS.

My own history began in the Santa Cruz Valley at the Canoa Ranch where my father worked. My earliest memories are of life in an extraordinary, scenic valley; and they comprise a very important part of who I am today.

H.R. 324 designates the Santa Cruz Valley region of Arizona as a national heritage area. This would allow the National Park Service to support existing and future State and local conservation efforts through Federal recognition, seed money, and technical assistance.

The Santa Cruz Valley is one of America's longest inhabited regions, with traces of human occupation extending back 12,000 years. The region was not only the center of centuries of Native American culture and history but also served as a corridor of Spanish exploration, colonization, and missionary activity; and a frontier of Mexican and early American mining, ranching, and agriculture. Today the valley is a leading center of desert ecology, climate research, astronomy, optics, and archeology.

The historic Spanish missions, presidio fortresses, and ranches are found throughout the valley. Streets lined with Sonoran-style adobe houses recall the period when the region was part of Mexico. Ghost towns, old mines, territorial-style ranch houses, remnants of the mining and cattle industries date to the 1850s when this area became part of the United States.

The valley sweeps across the Santa Cruz and eastern Pima County, encom-

passing cactus-covered slopes, open grasslands, rugged canyons, forested mountain ranges rising to more than 9,000 feet, and lush oases created by rare desert streams. That varied landscape provides many different habitats that are home to a diversity of plant and animal life, including tropical species, unique desert species, and mountaintop survivors from the Ice Age.

The heritage area designated by H.R. 324 includes two national parks, four State parks, six large county parks, four major lakes, two designated scenic highways, and several hundred miles of backcountry trails and urban bike-ways.

The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail, designated by Congress in 1990, runs along the Santa Cruz River for the length of the heritage area. The Butterfield Overland Dispatch Trail also crosses the valley. Also included are 32 museums, as well as 28 districts and 102 individual buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and dozens of prehistoric and historic archeological sites.

A July 2005 study by the Center for Desert Archaeology, on which the bill is based, examined the many resources of the region and found that the area meets the 10 criteria set forth by the National Park Service for proposed heritage areas.

H.R. 324 designates the area; sets out the duties of the management organization and the requirements for a management plan; requires the Secretary of the Interior to approve or disapprove of the plan within 180 days; provides criteria for judging that plan; allows the Secretary to provide technical assistance and grants; and authorizes \$15 million over 15 years, with no more than \$1 million to be appropriated in any fiscal year. All Federal funds must be matched by contributions from non-Federal sources. The bill includes extensive protections for private property owners and prohibits the use of Federal lands received under the act for land acquisition.

H.R. 324 is strongly supported throughout the Santa Cruz Valley. All incorporated local governments have supported it and have given this proposal their formal support. Other supporters include two Native American tribes, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations, the Arizona Office of Tourism and other tourism councils, the Southern Arizona Home Builders Association, conservation groups and developers, and many other businesses and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to say a few words about the heritage areas in general. This is a well-established, well-tested program that has been operating for 25 years. There are 49 heritage areas running in 29 States. Well over 50 million people live, work, and recreate inside the national heritage area.

Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service and the Alliance of National Heritage Areas commissioned Michigan

State University to study the economic impacts of the national heritage area. The study found that just one national heritage area resulted in \$780,000 in wages and salaries; \$1.2 million in value added, mostly from dining and lodging; and created 51 jobs. If you extend this to all the heritage areas, we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in economic benefit to local communities and roughly 2,500 jobs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 324, my bill to help preserve a fascinating area full of history and culture and the wonders of nature.

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

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this legislation raises serious concerns about border security and the private property rights of private landowners by establishing an over 3,300-square-mile—let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker—3,300-square-mile national heritage area that includes land along the Arizona and Mexico border.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans support the wise and responsible stewardship of Federal lands. We also strongly believe the protection and conservation of natural areas is important. Yet it need not be done at the expense of our homeland security or the private property rights of U.S. citizens.

On the issue of homeland security, some of the most heavily trafficked drug smuggling and human trafficking routes in the United States would be designated as a national heritage area under this bill. To make matters worse, the bill lacks sufficient protections to ensure that border security enforcement, drug interdiction and illegal immigration control is not restricted, is not hindered, and is not impeded by this legislation.

At a time when our borderlands are far from secure, now is simply not the time to place yet another layer of Federal interference in these areas. It is critical that policies meant to conserve natural areas or to preserve or promote unique areas in our Nation do not become corridors for illegal activities that threaten the safety and security of United States citizens.

This Congress must ensure that the responsibilities of the Border Patrol and the Department of Homeland Security are not undercut by the actions of another agency or Department. This is especially true with the Department of the Interior, which, Mr. Speaker, controls 40 percent of the lands along the southern border.

In response to concerns raised about the lack of border security protections in this bill, the Democrat majority has used their power on the Rules Committee to automatically add meager text to this bill that falls far short of

meaningful protection of our border security. This meager text simply states that no border enforcement authority is being modified, altered, or amended.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this leaves the barn door open to the reality that this heritage area designation could restrict, could hinder or impede border enforcement or security authority, including drug interdiction and illegal immigration control.

It also completely fails to address the effects that other existing laws are having over the ability of the Border Patrol and the Department of Homeland Security to achieve operational control of the border.

Instead of addressing the hurdles to border security that exist on public land, this bill, frankly, Mr. Speaker, exacerbates them.

On the issue of property rights, this legislation does include language that expresses support for property protection. I will acknowledge that. However, the bill omits stronger protections that have been included in many of the other recently established heritage areas.

What should be included in this bill is an assurance that the written consent of property owners be acquired before their property is included into the planning activities of the heritage area's management entities. Property owners should also be permitted the choice to opt out of the heritage area's boundaries if they choose.

Now, as I noted, the bill does include language related to private property, and it does say that property owners are allowed to "refrain from participation." Yet, Mr. Speaker, nothing changes the fact that this bill places property owners within a new Federal designation.

□ 1430

It would allow a basis for ambitious Federal land managers to claim that now they have a mandate and millions of Federal dollars to interfere with local decisions affecting the private property of others.

The reality is that there are likely a great number of property owners who have no idea that they are being included in this heritage area designation. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about over 3,300 square miles. This House should insist that the weak and ineffectual provisions of the bill are strengthened with real and meaningful protections that protect all landowners with the choice to opt out of this designation.

With deep concern, Mr. Speaker, across the country over the growing intrusion of the Federal Government into our daily lives, as evidenced by the debate on health care in this country and private choices of American citizens, great caution and care should be taken to protect the property rights of the thousands and thousands of property owners located within the over 3,300 square-mile heritage area that is being proposed by this legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, without sufficient protections for private property rights and the security of our southern border from drug smuggling and illegal immigration, I must oppose this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS).

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Chairman GRIJALVA, for bringing this bill forward.

I rise today in support of H.R. 324, the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Act. This bill would designate the area around the Santa Cruz River in southern Arizona as a national heritage area, from Marana in the north down to Patagonia in the south.

By designating this area a national heritage area, the beautiful Santa Cruz Valley region will receive modest Federal support for promoting the area's history, cultural resources, and the indigenous wildlife habitat. This designation will be a valuable tool to promote economic development and tourism in a rural area, in an area that has been hard hit by the downturn in the economy.

Just as important, we will be ensuring that visitors to the Santa Cruz Valley area can learn about this unique watershed that exists there and the diverse societies it has supported throughout hundreds of thousands of years. Native American tribes, descendants of Spanish ancestors, American pioneers, and now, members of a very diverse southern Arizona community.

Unfortunately, this bill has been the subject of much misinformation. Contrary to what some have said, the Santa Cruz Valley does not jeopardize private property rights. In fact, the bill language explicitly protects property rights. The bill also protects public use of federally managed lands. Having participated in and led dozens of meetings in that area, hearing from constituencies from the business community to the environmental community, folks across a broad spectrum, there is very strong support for this legislation. This is why the bill will move forward in a way that is very positive for the people of southern Arizona. I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 324 to support preserving Arizona's natural heritage.

Again, I commend the chairman for bringing the bill forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State and the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation, H.R. 324, because it weakens our border security and, therefore, endangers American lives.

Arizona's border with Mexico has become the focal point of much of the illegal immigration, drug smuggling,

and related violence in America. This legislation will adversely impact the ability of DHS to secure part of the border. Designation as a national heritage area can prevent the Border Patrol's access to the land. It could prevent agents from using motorized vehicles or flying helicopters at low altitudes.

Such policies encourage illegal immigration and drug smuggling. The smugglers and illegal immigrants know they have a better chance of eluding capture in these areas than in better enforced border areas.

In addition, the bill will have the exact opposite effect of its stated purpose "to conserve the region's heritage" since smugglers and illegal immigrants often cause environmental damage. They abandon huge volumes of trash and debris. Preventing Border Patrol agents from accessing these areas will only allow this environmental destruction to continue.

I understand that language has been added in an effort to address the concerns that have been raised, but the language is ambiguous and will invite lawsuits. It does not ensure that law enforcement officials will have access to the land and be able to secure the border.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, we should oppose this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full Resources Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the measure that is sponsored by our good friend from Arizona, the chairman of the National Parks, Forest and Public Lands Subcommittee, Representative GRIJALVA. I also rise, as I have said, and as I have done time and time and time again, to point out that the claim that national heritage areas harm the rights of private property owners is utterly false. F-A-L-S-E. Utterly false.

As Chairman GRIJALVA has already pointed out, H.R. 324 contains the extensive property rights protections included in every heritage area which has passed the House in recent years under both Democratic and Republican majorities, and signed into law by both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

So I would urge my colleagues to simply read the bill. On page 16, starting on line 4, it states, and I quote, "Nothing," N-O-T-H-I-N-G, "in this Act (1) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the National Heritage Area."

Furthermore, the bill makes clear that private property owners may not be forced to provide access to the public or any government agency, and the bill does not alter or expand any existing land use or other regulatory authority. These provisions cover every possible contingency however far-

fetched that the minority may dream up.

Let's look at the facts one more time. National heritage areas have been around for 25 years. Ronald Reagan signed the first one into law. Today we have 49 heritage areas in 29 States. Well over 50 million people live, work and recreate in a heritage area, 50 million people, and not one of them has been adversely affected. That's because heritage areas have no regulatory powers, no zoning authority, no power of eminent domain. Forty-nine heritage areas; 50 million people. That's almost my entire congressional district in a national heritage area.

As a matter of fact, the entire State of Tennessee is a national heritage area. It is the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area. That is the entire State of Tennessee. Think about it.

Last I heard, Dollywood was still booming. The Grand Ole Opry was still swinging. People were still engaging in commerce, holding homes, and contributing to the economy in Tennessee. I believe it is still on the map. And not one of them has had their private property rights diminished. And in all of these areas over all of these years, there has never been a single instance where an individual's right to private property was abridged.

The Government Accountability Office interviewed property rights advocacy groups, and even they were unable to provide a single example. Not a single one. So this is the biggest red herring that I have ever come across.

Nevertheless, we have included these property rights protections in H.R. 324 to make clear once again that national heritage areas do not threaten private property. At some point in order to retain even a shred of credibility, those who make these claims will either have to produce some evidence or admit their mistake.

Seriously, folks, these allegations are beginning to wear thin. You have no evidence whatsoever.

As to the pending measure, the Santa Cruz Valley is a treasure trove of natural and cultural resources and it would be shameful, simply shameful indeed, if we lost the opportunity to protect and preserve these resources based on irresponsible accusations that were proven false long, long, long ago. So I urge support for H.R. 324.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to another member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 324, the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area.

This 3,300 miles shares already overlapping jurisdictions between the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, the Department of Defense, and then there are some residents of the tribes, the Pascua and the Tohono people, as well.

This area is a very high traffic volume for contraband, that being illegal drugs and illegal people, coming up through this corridor. I have traveled that corridor and visited as recently as last July, a little over a month and a half ago. We know that in some cases there have been national park lands marked off limits to the people of the United States because the illegal drug traffic and the litter has gotten so bad. It is too dangerous. They wouldn't take me there.

We need to enforce the laws on our border and not complicate the overlapping jurisdictions that are there. We know that the Border Patrol has enough trouble trying to get to an operational control of the border without having to deal with an additional area that would be a national heritage area added on top of it.

I am not sure about the State of Tennessee, but I would wonder if the TVA didn't come in there about the time Tennessee was declared a national heritage area, and it seems to me that the private sector was nudged out with that move, if my recollection of history is accurate.

But the bill still lacks sufficient protections that would allow the free flow of our U.S. border security personnel for drug interdiction and illegal immigration enforcement.

I would add also on the Coronado National Forest, that is in the center of this location and that is a direct conduit of illegal traffic coming through. So we need the jurisdiction to be such that it is free-flowing, and we need to enforce our immigration laws. We need to provide operational control of the border.

I would also point out that some of the difficulties we have in enforcing our immigration laws are also rooted in our inability to enforce even under current circumstances. And in this designation, I will be able to roll out my map and point to you, Mr. Speaker, the spot or locations, mountaintop after mountaintop, that are surveillance locations for the U.S. law enforcement that is trying to enforce illegal immigration and illegal drugs and the interdiction of same coming up through this corridor.

This serves no real purpose to accomplish anything other than to draw down Federal moneys. And as I look through this bill, and I didn't get them all marked, but I see the word "fund" or "funds" or "resources" being used over and over again.

The attention I would draw to page 5 of the bill, line 12, specify existing and potential sources of funding or economic development strategies to interpret, fund, manage.

And the same page of the bill, line 25, recommend fund, manage. And it goes on and on. As I go through the bill, it looks to me like it is a method to figure out how to drawn down Federal funds.

Page 9 of the bill, line 5, enhance, interpret, fund, manage.

Federal funds implementation, on page 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would continue. On page 10, it references implementation. The local coordinating entity. It references use of Federal funds.

□ 1445

On page 13, the amounts leveraged with Federal funds is referenced again.

On page 14, lines 19, 20 and 21, "heritage planning; obtain funds from any source, including Federal programs," Mr. Speaker.

Page 15, line 4, "The local coordinating entity may not use Federal funds authorized under this act." So there is a prohibition there in reference to funds.

Then with regard to the property rights component of this, we have seen this language before. "Nothing abridges the rights of any property owner." That is kind of like the bill that came to the floor that said there are no earmarks in this bill, but there were thousands of them. To define it away doesn't mean it goes away.

I rise in opposition to this, and I would urge a "no" vote on H.R. 324.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I would just extend congratulations to my colleague that just finished speaking. He caught us. This is a grant-funded program. Heritage areas have been grant-funded programs for 25 years, and I am glad that he was able to find that and point that out.

Those of us that represent the border understand how painful, how divisive, and in some areas how devastating what is going on on the border is. Not only with unauthorized entries, but with the drug cartels coming one way, the gun runners going the other way sending guns to Mexico, we understand it is very painful, and the inactivity of this Congress to deal with that immigration issue has made that pain even more severe. But I think it is wrong to try to deal with an immigration issue that people are either afraid to deal with or exploit for political purposes and try to layer that on to a heritage area in the Santa Cruz Valley.

I say that for far too long when we talk about the border region, it is always in a negative context. Always. And for too long, the people that live there, the people that raise their families there, the people that work there, the culture, the natural heritage that that area has is ignored, underfunded, and never really dealt with.

This is an opportunity to do something along a border region that is not going to promote illegal crossings, that is not going to impede any law enforcement, including Border Patrol, from carrying out their duty and the application of the law; to do something for

an area, a part of the United States of America, to do something for that area and say this is special, this is unique, we want to work with this area and show that uniqueness to the rest of the country.

I think it is an opportunity to do more than just scapegoat and fear monger about border issues and do something positive, something necessary, and something that will tell the people that live there, like many of us do, you are worthy, you are in this country, you are United States citizens, and we acknowledge that because of the special unique heritage that you bring to this country.

I think this is part of this discussion today, and we shouldn't let fear-mongering and we shouldn't let scapegoating dominate the decision that needs to be made on this legislation, which is to approve it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. RAHALL, spoke at length about private property rights, and, as is not unusual, there are differing opinions of that.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, an article from the North Dakota Farm Bureau written by an individual, Mr. Harold Maxwell, who belongs to the Arizona Farm Bureau. He lives in Yuma. He was involved in a heritage designation in that area and he worked very hard to get private property rights protection included in that area of Arizona. But he has an article that I think spells out a lot of what we were talking about on our side of the need to further protect private property rights.

GET INVOLVED TO PROTECT PROPERTY RIGHTS
(By Harold Maxwell)

ARIZONA, February 27, 2008—Recently, there has been extensive discussion in Arizona about the proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area. As one of the individuals that worked to resolve some of the issues that arose from the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, I have a unique view on the potential pitfalls and benefits of having a National Heritage Area (NHA).

First, let me state that the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area in its final form has been a benefit to our community. That being said, two main issues exist that must be addressed to ensure that a National Heritage Area truly is a benefit to the local community, rather than a threat.

First let's tackle the issue of individual property rights. Proponents of another proposed NHA, the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area (LCRVNHA), cite two main reasons why the local populous should not be concerned about their property rights. The authors of the proposed Heritage Area bill like to point to specific language in the bill that they included in an attempt to afford property owners some protection.

They also like to cite a 2004 study by the GAO that found no issues affecting property values or use. Let me address both of those issues.

Most legislation that designates a NHA and its subsequent management plan includes language that prohibits the National Park Service and/or the Heritage Board from

using eminent domain to acquire property. These management plans also prohibit the use of the Federal funds obtained under the bill from being used to acquire land. Unfortunately, these "protections" are limited.

The proposed LCRVNHA bill does not prohibit local governments from changing zoning ordinances to conform to the land use plans suggested by the Heritage Area Board. Local governments find themselves in a difficult situation: either adopt the new land use plans and put local property owners at risk, or reject the land use plans and put their federal funding at risk.

This is not just idle conjecture. The Wheeling National Heritage Area, Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Essex National Heritage Area, Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor, and the Journey Through Hallowed Ground NHAs are just a few examples of where local zoning was changed to accommodate the management plan and those changes did negatively impact local land owners' property rights.

The other statement, that no federal funds obtained under the bill can be used to acquire land, is also misleading. This statement only applies to funds authorized by Congress for a Heritage Area. Any matching funds that are raised are free to be spent however the Heritage Area Board sees fit.

This is not an insignificant problem. Heritage Areas on average receive \$8 in matching funds for every \$1 that is provided under the Heritage Area Act. Far and away the majority of the funds generated by a Heritage Area are eligible to purchase private property, or issue conservation or historical easements. This is of particular significance in Arizona, as only 13% of our land is privately owned. Any acquisition that removes land from the tax rolls has the potential for a huge negative impact on the amount of property tax collected for our local communities.

Even a more serious issue is the potential of a Heritage Area to acquire land and then donate the land to the National Park Service (NPS). This is what happened with the Shenandoah Valley Battlefield Foundation. The Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Park as it is now known was created in 2003 by using a combination of donated lands and conservation easements. Though National Heritage Areas do not impose direct restrictions on property this is not the case for the NPS. Federal law grants the National Parks the right to impose specific land use restrictions on properties adjacent to their boundaries.

A March 2004 Governmental Accounting Office (GAO) study on heritage areas is the Holy Grail for the National Heritage Areas' claim that Heritage Areas do not impact property rights. The GAO study claims to have found no issues affecting property values or use. This has always been perplexing to me as I know of three separate incidences involving property rights and the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area.

Having read the GAO report, I now believe that I can shed some light on the subject. In regard to the Yuma events, the GAO report was published in March 2004. The meeting held in Yuma concerning property rights, with an attendance of more than 600 Yuma County residents, was held the end of February 2004. One of the reasons that the GAO did not find any incidents in Yuma was that the publication had gone to press by the time of the Yuma meeting.

It was also noted in the GAO's report that the survey was limited to "national groups" and apparently did not include a survey of individual property owners in the more than three-dozen NHAs already in existence. It is also evident that the GAO was only concerned about the immediate impact of the bill and not the consequences from the land

use planning that was encouraged by the National Heritage Areas. When one reviews the literature looking for cases where NHAs have influenced local zoning ordinances, it becomes apparent even to the casual observer that NHAs can and do have the ability to affect property rights.

LOCAL CONTROL

The second major concern involving National Heritage Areas is local control. No clearer example of the benefit of local control can be found than the Yuma experience. After the Yuma Crossing Heritage Area Bill passed Congress designating 22-square miles of Yuma as a National Heritage Area, the local agencies responsible for zoning started to interpret what it meant to own property in and around the boundaries of the new Heritage Area. It was these decisions made by bureaucrats that caused the local population to become concerned about their property rights. Local pressure was brought to bear on the County Board of Supervisors and the City of Yuma to pass resolutions instructing staff not to use the boundaries of the New Heritage Area in determining zoning issues. This solved the immediate issue, but the community realized that the Yuma Crossing Heritage Act was a federal law that would become more difficult to change as federal monies were invested.

We also understood that the local resolutions could be lifted at some time in the future after the Heritage area was well established. The local community decided, for their own protection, to reduce the scope of the project back to what was originally proposed: 4 square miles or 2,560 acres of downtown Yuma and the Colorado River inside the levee system. Even with strong local support it took Yuma over 3 years to change the original legislation. The Yuma community now believes that this new boundary is focused enough that even if the local ordinances are changed the community will be protected from their impact. One of the benefits of such a focused area is that we have enough money to effect change. If one assumes that their Heritage Area will get all of the potential \$10 million from the federal government, and no project has, then the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area has the potential of receiving a little more than \$3,900 per acre for our project, as compared to the \$710 per acre it could have received under the original scope.

The proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area is too large. At over 23,000 square miles or 14,720,000 acres, it falls into the trap that some of the other Heritage Areas have fallen into: On a per acre basis the Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area will at a maximum receive only 68 cents per acre under the bill. When a Heritage area is too large the funds are insufficient to get the project up and running on a self-sustaining basis. One of the goals for all Heritage areas is to be self-sustaining at the sunset of their authorization bill in 15 years.

Yuma learned that local control is critical. When issues arose it was relatively easy to convince our County Board of Supervisors and the Yuma City Council to pass resolutions protecting our citizens. The proposed Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area covers parts of four states, seven Native American Nations, and 27 counties. How do you have local control in such a large entity? The only effective control is on a county, sovereign nation, or city basis. When a project covers so many different governing agencies the only way for the project to work is for the local governments to cede local control to the Heritage Area. After having looked at some of the major pitfalls with the Little Colorado River Valley Herit-

age Area, these are the changes I would recommend in the plan if your community chooses to go forward.

First, maintain local control. One 23,000 square mile heritage area managed out of Tucson with some local people appointed to the board is not local control. The Little Colorado River Valley National Heritage Area includes parts of 4 states, 7 Native American nations, and 27 counties. At the very least there should be 34 separate Heritage Areas divided along county and Native American nation lines. This would give control down to the county or nation level. A side benefit would be that each heritage area would be eligible for \$10 million in government funds on their own. That is a potential of \$340 million dollars in federal funds vs. the current proposal of \$10 million. Learn from the Yuma experience. If Yuma reduced the size of its Heritage Area from 22 square miles to 4 square miles due to concerns over property rights, one can only imagine the potential issues with the 23,000 square mile Heritage Area that is being proposed.

Secondly, be very focused. One of the ways that you can protect yourselves against property rights abuse is to make certain that the areas that are included are well defined and include cultural, historical and environmental areas that can be developed into self sustaining economic zones. Vast expanses of the current proposal would not fit these criteria. Heritage Areas are intended to be self-sustaining after the first 15 years of existence.

Finally, the legislation authorizing the Heritage Area should prohibit the Heritage Area from using any of the funds raised to buy private property or to purchase any form of easement (conservation, historical etc.). This would ensure that private property stays on the tax rolls and is not retired. It also would ensure that land is not "donated" by the Heritage Area to create a new or expanded National Park.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the distinguished ranking member on the Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, and I ask unanimous consent that he control the time after he uses his time for his debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think a couple of the speakers have given what is one of the crux problems, not of this, the Santa Cruz Heritage Area, but of the overall issue itself. The gentleman from Arizona, who does a good job in representing his constituents, did say there are 49 heritage areas that have been heritage areas for the last 25 years, and therein is the problem.

When Mo Udall was chairman of that committee and Bruce Vento was the subcommittee chairman, that is the first time this concept of a heritage area was introduced. The concept was going to be that this was start-up money, and then the heritage areas would be on their own. Bruce Vento did say, 10 years and we are out of there.

This was never supposed to be a 25-year program for any of these areas.

The problem is that when the 10 years are up, we keep extending the time limit on these areas and we keep extending the life and giving more and more money to these areas. In fact, it has become such a part that there is a cottage industry that has developed going out to areas to train them on how they can become and stay a heritage area to get more and more funding. It violates the very concept of why heritage areas were there in the first place.

This year alone we have added nine new heritage areas. This bill itself has \$15 million, which is a 50 percent increase on what the majority of heritage areas do receive.

The problem is very simple: This heritage area is to try to expand its tourism and other elements, and other areas pay for it. So if you are in tourist area A, you are now being taxed and your money will go to promote tourism in area B. And if that was simply a start-up fund, simply to get them started, none of us really have objections to that. But it isn't. It is becoming perpetual as we extend and extend and spend and spend more and more on these elements.

This particular heritage area in front of us covers 3,300 square miles, private and public land. When Republicans were in charge of this committee, as a standard we always included language in heritage area legislation that gave property owners the ability to opt out of boundaries. It was a compromise. It was weak, but at least it was there.

What we are trying to say in that is that people should have a voice in what is done to them. People should be given choices and options. And we should not refrain from doing that. We should not have the government setting what the standard is, what the boundary is, what the requirement is. And there are instances when outside groups have tried to pressure local zoning entities because of these boundaries.

It is not right that people should be locked inside a boundary, oftentimes with little prior knowledge of what is actually happening, because boundaries do have consequences. Otherwise, why have these boundaries?

If these heritage areas are so innocuous, there is no reason to lock an owner in. Give them the opportunity for full information so they can make decisions and, again, give them the choices of what they wish to do. That is how we should be treating individuals and property owners.

This area is one that is heavily traveled with narcotic trafficking, human trafficking, and now I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Arizona and the Rules Committee in a self-executing rule did give some modicum of protection on these areas.

As late as last July we attempted in committee to try and put language similar to this to give some protection

in these areas. Rejected—not on a partisan vote, because several of the opposition side actually did vote with us, but nonetheless rejected in committee. I am proud of Representative GRIJALVA for now including this language in this bill, but it could be better, and that is the issue before us.

Less than a week ago, the GAO revealed that secure border initiatives are behind schedule, are years behind schedule, because of environmental delays. That simply means there are people out there within the National Park Service that blame the Border Patrol for environmental damage.

The Park Service's own admission is that it takes 6 months to complete documents necessary to place critical border protection technologies, like observation towers. There was one tower stopped on the border areas until they could prove in some kind of scientific study that the Sonoran pronghorn deer would leave that area of their own volition and would not be scared by these towers. I am sorry, that is ridiculous, but that is the reality of why we are here and the reality of what is happening.

So there are some concerns with this area. The majority did put language in there to try and protect border security and the border areas, and I am thankful for that and I applaud you for doing that, but you could have taken a big step further.

In this bill you did put some language in there to try and protect personal property, but you could have gone further just simply to say people should have the choice and the option of what they are doing. And once again we have a problem of heritage areas, supposed to be temporary, supposed to be start-up, staying year after year after year, getting fund after fund after fund of public money from point A to fund the exact thing that is happening in point B in competition with point A.

We have to rethink this thing, which is indeed what the Park Service asked us to do several years ago, to not produce anymore of these heritage areas until we come up with a comprehensive plan of how we are going to function with these heritage areas.

With that, Mr. Speaker, once again, the Republic will not falter if this bill passes, but it could have been much, much better, and it could have done much more to protect not only our border security but also the rights of individuals than what we are doing here. There are some good steps forward, I admit, but we have a long, long way to go. Once again, we still have the problem of what to do with heritage areas that are supposed to be temporary and simply will not go away.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Arizona if he has any more speakers?

Mr. GRIJALVA. No.

Mr. BISHOP. In that situation, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in summary, I think H.R. 324 is a good

piece of legislation. When the heritage areas were formed 25 years ago, I don't believe Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, knew how successful they were going to be, how popular they were going to be, how much private money that these initiatives would leverage in communities, and, because of that, it continues to be popular with Members of both sides of the aisle.

The other issue is, as we go through this legislation and debate what is in there or not, I don't believe that there is a level of appeasement that we can put into this legislation that would garner the support from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

It is a good piece of legislation. I consider this not only good for the region that I represent, but beginning the process of on-the-border lands dealing with issues comprehensively. One of those issues is to recognize the richness, the diversity and the history of the region.

The other area that I want to talk about briefly is the issue of border enforcement. The problems along the border with enforcement are not due to the creation of heritage areas. They are not the reason that we have unauthorized crossings. They are not the reason that we have drug cartels. They are not the reason that we have organized gun runners from the United States. Those are not the reasons. Heritage areas are not to blame for that horrible situation. And the inability of Homeland Security over the last 5 years to effectively put their technology to work, to effectively do the kind of border security initiatives that they needed, environmental issues are not the cause of that.

□ 1500

I would say ineptitude, inefficiencies and waste of money were the reasons that that didn't get done. This bill solves a problem. It solves a problem of a region badly needing a shot in the arm, an acknowledgement that it is and continues to be a valued part of this great Nation of ours.

I yield back the remainder of my time and ask that the legislation be supported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 760, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah moves to recommit the bill H.R. 324 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

In section 5(c)(1) of the bill, insert “, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security.” after “Secretary”.

In section 8(c) of the bill, amend paragraph (4) to read as follows:

(4) modifies, restricts, impedes, hinders, or supplants any border enforcement or security authority, including drug interdiction and illegal immigration control.

In section 9 of the bill, insert “(a) CLARIFICATION.—” before “Nothing”.

At the end of section 9 of the bill, add the following:

(b) PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER PROTECTION.—

(1) No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the National Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity.

(2) Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the National Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from within the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 13. BORDER SECURITY.

Nothing in this Act may impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of the Secretary of Homeland Security to achieve operational control (as defined under Public Law 109-367) within the National Heritage Area.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered read.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity.

As I said, this bill could definitely be improved, and we are presenting some amendments in here that take the bill and make it a much better, stronger, significant bill.

I said in the original remarks that of course we have problems with heritage areas that simply will not go away. Even though they were supposed to be around for only 10 years, they keep living and living and consuming more and more funds. Having said that, I could still be supportive of this amendment if there were some specific guarantees placed in there for those specific issues that we have addressed in the past that actually could be a way we can move forward with other bills of a similar ilk.

Specifically in there, it deals with the idea of property rights. The gentleman from Arizona did sponsor legislation that dealt with the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area. This was an area created in the year 2000 and, according to the Arizona Farm Bureau, was much larger than local farmers were expecting. Further exacerbating the problem, local zoning bureaucrats began to use the heritage area boundaries in planning. The problem is, once established, those entities had no recourse as private property owners to exempt themselves unless you came to Congress and had Congress adjust the boundaries. The gentleman from Arizona did that. We passed a law that shrunk the size of those areas down. That is a cumbersome and silly process to go through when all we need to do is give people the opportunity of being informed and make decisions for themselves so they can remove themselves when they wish to. That is what this amendment does. It asks the properties owners, before being included, to give their consent to be included in this new entity.

Now some will say, well, that's burdensome and difficult. It's hard to find all the property owners in an area. Yet when tax time comes, the government entities have an easy time finding all the property owners in an area. We could do the same thing, because the matter is not how efficient it is or how easy it is. The matter should be that private property rights are not a burden to government, and they should be respected in every way that is possible, especially in these areas where the National Park Service, who will be administering this, does not have a celebrated history of respecting private property rights and finding unique ways of having willing sellers.

This language that we are proposing should become the standard template for all legislation that deals with heritage areas and how we handle private property rights within those. This bill draws boundaries on a map. It covers and surrounds private property owners and then gives them no real recourse to remove themselves from those boundaries. Even if it says they don't have to participate, that is not the same thing, and it does have consequences. When it comes to border security, this bill is a perfect effort for us to move forward in some specific way.

Now, as I said, I commend the gentleman for actually adding some language that we have been trying to add to these types of bills in committee. But the language here is not necessarily enough. The sad situation that we find—not because of this bill, nor will it be solved because of this bill unless we add this particular language—is that the Border Patrol finds itself in a position of subservience to the National Park Service. I don't think Americans really know that when a Border Patrol agent crosses into a national park, he has to get out of his car, park it and walk. I don't think

they realize that the Border Patrol has to consult with the National Park Service before they can put up an antenna on that border. Their amendment gets some language in there to try to not impede or prohibit. But what we also put in this amendment is language that says that nothing will happen that will hinder or restrict our homeland security on border areas. This is a perfect opportunity to do so. It is there.

This amendment, for the first time, says that when those land use plans—and the bulk of the border in which the drug traffic and human traffic is coming are on public lands—it says that Homeland Security must be consulted in coming up with the land use plans. So they are an equal partner because this is significant. Right now they are not. This amendment is going to move us forward so that Homeland Security will not be impeded in their element. They will not have to wait to put up surveillance to see if a particular sheep will, on its own volition, move or not move. That is ridiculous, but that is what we are trying to do with this amendment.

Once again, this amendment takes the bill and improves it, which is why I'm proud of this amendment. This amendment clearly states what property rights are and which property owners may be in a heritage area which, as we have noted, does not go away in 10 years but tends to last on and on and on.

This amendment clearly gives Homeland Security, for the first time, a right to be an equal player in the decision of how to handle these lands, and this also gives us the right to make sure that nothing hinders or restricts what we do on the border.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise to claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have come to accept the fact that redundancy is part of the process here that we go through. So in accepting that reality, let me just state one more time, nowhere in this legislation is there an infringement, a taking of private property rights. Nowhere.

The motion asks that close to a quarter of a million property owners, if not more, be notified and asked to either be part of or not be part of this heritage area. That process would create a Swiss cheese designation for that area; and in the previous 49, there is not one incident where a private property owner has been forced, coerced into being part of or permitting their private property to be used as a designation. That is already in the legislation.

With regard to the issue of border enforcement, again, I asked the Rules Committee to insert that so there

would be clarification that the activities of Homeland Security, plus all other local enforcement—the sheriffs, local police, tribal police, et cetera—that their ability to carry out their mission and enforce the law was part and parcel and that the heritage area in no way would impinge, infringe or restrict that ability. That is already in the legislation.

So why the motion to recommit? I think it's just part of a very cynical exploitation of a very, very divisive issue in this country, the issue of immigration and the issue of unauthorized people in this country. The heritage area is not responsible for that situation. It has been the inability of this Congress to come to grips with the situation that has aggravated and made it worse. And as a person who represents the border and has to deal with constituents that are affected by this decision every day, the lack of attention, serious, rational, mature attention to this issue, rather than exploitation of this issue, is what they're asking this Congress to do. The heritage area has nothing to do with how we're going to resolve this issue. The heritage area, for once, is an acknowledgement of a part of this country that for too long and, most recently, in a very cynical way has been exploited both as a region and the people who live there. We are saying, this heritage area is your acknowledgement that you're part and parcel of this country.

I ask that the motion to recommit be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 324, if ordered, and suspension of the rules with regard to H. Res. 696, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 167, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 727]

YEAS—259

Aderholt	Biggart	Boucher
Adler (NJ)	Bilbray	Boustany
Akin	Bilirakis	Boyd
Alexander	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Altmire	Bishop (NY)	Bright
Arcuri	Bishop (UT)	Brown (GA)
Austria	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Bachmann	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Bachus	Bocchieri	Ginny
Baird	Boehner	Buchanan
Barrow	Bonner	Burgess
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Burton (IN)
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Buyer
Bean	Boren	Calvert
Berkley	Boswell	Camp

Campbell	Hunter	Nye
Cantor	Inglis	Olson
Cao	Israel	Paul
Capito	Issa	Paulsen
Cardoza	Jenkins	Pence
Carney	Johnson (IL)	Perriello
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Peters
Cassidy	Jones	Peterson
Castle	Jordan (OH)	Petri
Chaffetz	Kagen	Pitts
Chandler	Kanjorski	Platts
Childers	Kind	Poe (TX)
Coble	King (IA)	Posey
Coffman (CO)	King (NY)	Price (GA)
Cole	Kingston	Putnam
Conaway	Kirk	Radanovich
Costa	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rehberg
Costello	Kissell	Reichert
Crenshaw	Klein (FL)	Richardson
Cuellar	Kline (MN)	Roe (TN)
Culberson	Kosmas	Rogers (AL)
Dahlkemper	Kratovil	Rogers (KY)
Davis (AL)	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Davis (KY)	Lance	Rohrabacher
Davis (TN)	Latham	Rooney
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
DeFazio	Latta	Roskam
Dent	Lee (NY)	Ross
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Diaz-Balart, M.	Linder	Ryan (WI)
Donnelly (IN)	Lipinski	Scalise
Dreier	LoBiondo	Schauer
Driehaus	Lucas	Schmidt
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Edwards (TX)	Lummis	Schwartz
Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Ellsworth	E.	Sessions
Emerson	Lynch	Sestak
Etheridge	Mack	Shadegg
Fallin	Maffei	Shimkus
Flake	Manzullo	Shuler
Fleming	Marchant	Shuster
Forbes	Markey (CO)	Simpson
Fortenberry	Marshall	Skelton
Foster	Massa	Smith (NE)
Fox	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)	Souder
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)	Space
Galleghy	McCaul	Stearns
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Sullivan
Gerlach	McCotter	Tanner
Giffords	McHenry	Taylor
Gingrey (GA)	McIntyre	Teague
Gohmert	McKeon	Terry
Goodlatte	McMahon	Thompson (PA)
Gordon (TN)	McMorris	Thornberry
Graves	Rodgers	Tiahrt
Griffith	McNerney	Tiberi
Guthrie	Meek (FL)	Titus
Hall (TX)	Melancon	Turner
Halvorson	Mica	Upton
Harman	Miller (FL)	Walden
Harper	Miller (MI)	Walz
Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Heller	Minnick	Moran (KS)
Hensarling	Mitchell	Whitfield
Herger	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Herseth Sandlin	Murphy (NY)	Wittman
Hill	Murphy, Patrick	Wolf
Himes	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)
Hodes	Myrick	Young (FL)
Hoekstra	Neugebauer	
Holden	Nunes	

NAYS—167

Abercrombie	Conyers	Green, Gene
Ackerman	Cooper	Grijalva
Andrews	Courtney	Gutierrez
Baca	Crowley	Hall (NY)
Baldwin	Cummings	Hare
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (IL)	Heinrich
Berry	DeGette	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hinche
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Hirono
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Holt
Butterfield	Edwards (MD)	Honda
Capps	Ellison	Hoyer
Carnahan	Engel	Insee
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Castor (FL)	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Chu	Fattah	(TX)
Clarke	Filner	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Frank (MA)	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Fudge	Kaptur
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Kennedy
Cohen	Grayson	Kildee
Connolly (VA)	Green, Al	Kilpatrick (MI)

Kilroy	Olver	Sherman
Kucinich	Ortiz	Sires
Langevin	Pallone	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Pastor (AZ)	Snyder
Lee (CA)	Payne	Speier
Levin	Perlmutter	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Stark
Loeb sack	Polis (CO)	Stupak
Lofgren, Zoe	Pomeroy	Sutton
Lowey	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Lujan	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Maloney	Rahall	Tierney
Markey (MA)	Rangel	Tonko
Matsui	Reyes	Towns
McCollum	Rodriguez	Tsongas
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Van Hollen
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Michaud	Rush	Wasserman
Miller (NC)	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Miller, George	Salazar	Waters
Mollohan	Sanchez, Linda	Watson
Moore (KS)	T.	Watt
Moore (WI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Sarbanes	Weiner
Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Welch
Murtha	Schiff	Wexler
Ross	Schrader	Wilson (OH)
Napolitano	Scott (GA)	Woolsey
Neal (MA)	Scott (VA)	Wu
Oberstar	Serrano	Yarmuth
Obey	Shea-Porter	

NOT VOTING—6

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Granger
Capuano	Doyle	Smith (NJ)

□ 1550

Messrs. ACKERMAN, SCHRADER, LEVIN, SCOTT of Georgia, ELLISON, SARBANES, COHEN, LANGEVIN, TONKO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, KISSELL, Mrs. MYRICK, Messrs. KING of New York, ROSKAM, BILIRAKIS, KAGEN, HODES, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. SESTAK, BOSWELL, BOREN, LYNCH, CHILDERS, KLEIN of Florida, MAFFEL, HOLDEN, MASSA, COSTELLO, DEFAZIO, MATHESON, Ms. TITUS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. HALVORSON, Messrs. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, DRIEHAUS, CHANDLER, MEEK of Florida, LIPINSKI, CUELLAR, DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Messrs. GORDON of Tennessee, TANNER, BISHOP of Georgia, PETERSON, BOYD, ROSS, KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Messrs. ETHERIDGE, EDWARDS of Texas, BOUCHER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. BERKLEY, Messrs. ISRAEL, BISHOP of New York, COSTA, SKELTON, CARDOZA, BAIRD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. HARMAN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 324, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIJALVA:

In section 5(c)(1) of the bill, insert “, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security,” after “Secretary”.

In section 8(c) of the bill, amend paragraph (4) to read as follows:

(4) modifies, restricts, impedes, hinders, or supplants any border enforcement or security authority, including drug interdiction and illegal immigration control.

In section 9 of the bill, insert “(a) CLARIFICATION.—” before “Nothing”.

At the end of section 9 of the bill, add the following:

(b) PRIVATE PROPERTY OWNER PROTECTION.—

(1) No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the National Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity.

(2) Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the National Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from within the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 13. BORDER SECURITY.

Nothing in this Act may impede, prohibit, or restrict activities of the Secretary of Homeland Security to achieve operational control (as defined under Public Law 109-367) within the National Heritage Area.

Mr. GRIJALVA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 281, noes 142, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 728]

AYES—281

Abercrombie	Bishop (UT)	Cardoza
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Carnahan
Adler (NJ)	Bocieri	Carney
Altmire	Boren	Carson (IN)
Andrews	Boswell	Castle
Arcuri	Boucher	Castor (FL)
Baca	Boyd	Chandler
Baird	Brady (PA)	Childers
Baldwin	Braley (IA)	Chu
Barrow	Bright	Clarke
Bean	Brown, Corrine	Clay
Becerra	Brown-Waite,	Cleaver
Berkley	Ginny	Clyburn
Berman	Buchanan	Cohen
Berry	Butterfield	Connolly (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Buyer	Conyers
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cooper

Costa Kilpatrick (MI) Pomeroy
 Costello Kilroy Posey
 Courtney Kind Price (NC)
 Crowley Kirk Quigley
 Cuellar Kirkpatrick (AZ) Rahall
 Cummings Kissell Rangel
 Dahlkemper Klein (FL) Reichert
 Davis (AL) Kosmas Reyes
 Davis (CA) Kratovil Richardson
 Davis (IL) Kucinich Rodriguez
 Davis (TN) Lance Ros-Lehtinen
 DeFazio Langevin Ross
 DeGette Larsen (WA) Rothman (NJ)
 DeLauro Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
 Dent LaTourette Ruppertsberger
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lee (CA) Rush
 Dicks Levin Ryan (OH)
 Dingell Lewis (GA) Salazar
 Doggett Lipinski Sánchez, Linda
 Donnelly (IN) LoBiondo T.
 Driehaus Loeb sack Sanchez, Loretta
 Edwards (MD) Lofgren, Zoe Sarbanes
 Edwards (TX) Lowey Schakowsky
 Ehlers Luján Schauer
 Ellison Lynch Schiff
 Ellsworth Maffei Schrader
 Engel Maloney Schwartz
 Eshoo Markey (CO) Scott (GA)
 Etheridge Markey (MA) Scott (VA)
 Farr Marshall Serrano
 Fattah Massa Sestak
 Filner Matheson Shea-Porter
 Fortenberry Matsui Sherman
 Foster McCarthy (NY) Shuler
 Frank (MA) McCollum Simpson
 Frelinghuysen McDermott Sires
 Fudge McGovern Skelton
 Gerlach McIntyre Slaughter
 Giffords McMahan Smith (WA)
 Gonzalez McNeerney Snyder
 Gordon (TN) Meek (FL) Space
 Grayson Meeks (NY) Speier
 Green, Al Melancon Spratt
 Green, Gene Michaud Stark
 Griffith Miller (NC) Stupak
 Grijalva Miller, George Sutton
 Gutierrez Minnick Tanner
 Hall (NY) Mitchell Taylor
 Halvorson Mollohan Teague
 Hare Moore (KS) Thompson (CA)
 Harman Moore (WI) Thompson (MS)
 Hastings (FL) Moran (VA) Thompson (PA)
 Heinrich Murphy (CT) Tierney
 Herse th Sandlin Murphy (NY) Titus
 Higgins Murphy, Patrick Tonko
 Hill Murphy, Tim Towns
 Himes Murtha Tsongas
 Hinchey Nadler (NY) Turner
 Hinojosa Napolitano Upton
 Hirono Neal (MA) Van Hollen
 Hodes Nye Velázquez
 Holden Oberstar Visclosky
 Holt Obey Walz
 Honda Olver Wasserman
 Hoyer Ortiz Schultz
 Inslee Pallone Waters
 Israel Pascrell Watson
 Jackson (IL) Pastor (AZ) Watt
 Jackson-Lee Paulsen Waxman
 (TX) Payne Weiner
 Johnson (GA) Perlmutter Welch
 Johnson, E. B. Perriello Wexler
 Jones Peters Wilson (OH)
 Kagen Peterson Woolsey
 Kanjorski Petri Wu
 Kaptur Pingree (ME) Yarmuth
 Kennedy Platts Young (AK)
 Kildee Polis (CO) Young (FL)

NOES—142

Aderholt Broun (GA) Davis (KY)
 Akin Brown (SC) Deal (GA)
 Alexander Burgess Dreier
 Austria Burton (IN) Duncan
 Bachmann Emerson
 Bachus Camp Fallin
 Bartlett Campbell Flake
 Barton (TX) Cantor Fleming
 Biggert Cao Forbes
 Bilbray Capito Foxx
 Bilirakis Carter Franks (AZ)
 Blackburn Cassidy Gallegly
 Blunt Chaffetz Garrett (NJ)
 Boehner Coble Gingrey (GA)
 Bonner Coffman (CO) Pitts
 Bono Mack Cole Goodlatte
 Boozman Conaway Graves
 Boustany Crenshaw Guthrie
 Brady (TX) Culberson Hall (TX)

Harper Manzullo Rogers (KY)
 Hastings (WA) Marchant Rogers (MI)
 Heller McCarthy (CA) Rohrabacher
 Hensarling McCaul Rooney
 Herger McClintock Roskam
 Hoekstra McCotter Royce
 Hunter McHenry Ryan (WI)
 Inglis McKeon Scalise
 Issa McMorris Schmidt
 Jenkins Rodgers Senses
 Johnson (IL) Mica Sessions
 Johnson, Sam Miller (FL) Shadegg
 Jordan (OH) Miller (MI) Shimkus
 King (IA) Miller, Gary Smith (NE)
 King (NY) Moran (KS) Smith (TX)
 Kingston Myrick Souder
 Kline (MN) Neugebauer Stearns
 Lamborn Nunes Sullivan
 Latham Olson Terry
 Latta Paul Thornberry
 Lee (NY) Pence Tiahrt
 Lewis (CA) Pitts Tiberi
 Linder Poe (TX) Walden
 Lucas Price (GA) Wamp
 Luetkemeyer Putnam Westmoreland
 Lumms Radanovich Whitfield
 Lungren, Daniel Renberg Wilson (SC)
 E. Roe (TN) Wittman
 Mack Rogers (AL) Wolf

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (SC) Diaz-Balart, M. Schock
 Capuano Doyle Shuster
 Delahunt Granger Smith (NJ)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1559

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTERN WYOMING COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 696.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 696.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOEB SACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 729]

AYES—418

Abercrombie Austria Bean
 Ackerman Baca Becerra
 Aderholt Bachmann Berkley
 Adler (NJ) Bachus Berman
 Akin Baird Berry
 Alexander Baldwin Biggert
 Altmire Barrow Bilbray
 Andrews Barton (TX) Bilirakis

Bishop (GA) Filner Linder
 Bishop (NY) Flake Lipinski
 Bishop (UT) Fleming LoBiondo
 Blackburn Forbes Loeb sack
 Blumenuauer Fortenberry Lofgren, Zoe
 Blunt Foster Lowey
 Boccheri Foxx Lucas
 Bonner Frank (MA) Luetkemeyer
 Bono Mack Franks (AZ) Luján
 Boozman Frelinghuysen Lungren, Daniel
 Boren Fudge E.
 Boswell Gallegly Lynch
 Boucher Garrett (NJ) Mack
 Boustany Gerlach Maffei
 Boyd Giffords Maloney
 Brady (PA) Gingrey (GA) Manzullo
 Brady (TX) Gohmert Marchant
 Braley (IA) Gonzalez Markey (CO)
 Bright Goodlatte Markey (MA)
 Broun (GA) Gordon (TN) Marshall
 Brown (SC) Graves Massa
 Brown, Corrine Grayson Matheson
 Brown-Waite, Green, Al Matsui
 Ginny Green, Gene McCarthy (CA)
 Buchanan Griffith McCarthy (NY)
 Burgess Grijalva McCaul
 Burton (IN) Guthrie McClintock
 Butterfield Gutierrez McCollum
 Buyer Hall (NY) McCotter
 Calvert Hall (TX) McDermott
 Camp Halvorson McGovern
 Campbell Hare McHenry
 Cantor Harman McIntyre
 Cao Harper McKeon
 Capito Hastings (FL) McMahan
 Capps Hastings (WA) McMorris
 Cardoza Heinrich Rodgers
 Carnahan Heller McNeerney
 Carney Hensarling Meek (FL)
 Carson (IN) Herger Meeks (NY)
 Carter Herse th Sandlin Melancon
 Cassidy Higgins Mica
 Castle Hill Michaud
 Castor (FL) Himes Miller (FL)
 Chaffetz Hinchey Miller (MI)
 Chandler Hinojosa Miller (NC)
 Childers Hirono Miller, Gary
 Chu Hodes Miller, George
 Clarke Hoekstra Mitchell
 Clay Holt Mollohan
 Cleaver Honda Moore (KS)
 Clyburn Hoyer Moore (WI)
 Coble Hunter Moran (KS)
 Coffman (CO) Ingليس Moran (VA)
 Cohen Inslee Murphy (CT)
 Cole Israel Murphy (NY)
 Conaway Issa Murphy, Patrick
 Connolly (VA) Jackson (IL) Murphy, Tim
 Conyers Jackson-Lee Murtha
 Cooper (TX) Myrick
 Costa Jenkins Nadler (NY)
 Costello Johnson (GA) Napolitano
 Courtney Johnson (IL) Neal (MA)
 Crenshaw Johnson, E. B. Neugebauer
 Crowley Jones Nunes
 Cuellar Jones Nye
 Culberson Jordan (OH) Oberstar
 Cummings Kagen Obey
 Dahlkemper Kanjorski Olson
 Davis (AL) Kaptur Oliver
 Davis (CA) Kennedy Ortiz
 Davis (IL) Kildee Pallone
 Davis (KY) Kilpatrick (MI) Pascrell
 Davis (TN) Kilroy Pastor (AZ)
 Deal (GA) Kind Paul
 DeFazio King (IA) Paulsen
 DeGette King (NY) Payne
 DeLauro Kingston Pence
 Dent Kirk Perlmutter
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kirkpatrick (AZ) Perriello
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kissell Peters
 Dicks Klein (FL) Peterson
 Dingell Kline (MN) Petri
 Donnelly (IN) Kosmas Pingree (ME)
 Dreier Kratovil Pitts
 Driehaus Kucinich Platts
 Duncan Lamborn Poe (TX)
 Edwards (MD) Lance Polis (CO)
 Edwards (TX) Langevin Pomeroy
 Ehlers Larsen (WA) Posey
 Ellison Larson (CT) Price (GA)
 Ellsworth Latham Price (NC)
 Emerson LaTourette Putnam
 Engel Latta Quigley
 Eshoo Lee (CA) Radanovich
 Etheridge Lee (NY) Rahall
 Fallin Fallin Rangel
 Farr Lewis (CA) Rehberg
 Fattah Lewis (GA) Reichert