the hard work of these agencies; but we know that much work needs to be done.

H. Res. 575 will not stop criminal activity. It will not protect our citizens from sinister behavior, but it does take this important step: it brings to light the relevant issues facing Internet usage, and hopefully it will help educate the American people of the need to be watchful of Internet activity, especially as it affects our Nation's children.

We have an obligation, indeed, to educate the American people about existing problems of Internet use. This resolution will help. It is an extremely important one, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just sum up briefly with our congratulations to the author of the legislation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). As the other speakers have said, the Internet provides a great upside opportunity for education, entertainment and the like, but it certainly has its dark side as well. Those of us who worked on the Child Online Protection Act understand how difficult some of these circumstances can be with children having access to some of this terrible material.

While the Child Online Protection Act, which passed virtually unanimously in the 105th Congress, is now undergoing judicial review, whether in fact we are successful or not ultimately in getting that legislation to be considered constitutional the real issue is how do we deal in the meantime with educating our children to the potential dangers of the Internet. That is why this legislation has such importance, has such broad-based support from both sides of the aisle.

So that is why it is important that we pass this legislation today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 575, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A STANDARD TIME ZONE FOR GUAM AND THE MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3756) to establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3756

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

SECTION 1. TIME ZONE ESTABLISHED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 261; commonly known as the Calder Act) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''eight zones'' and inserting ''nine zones''; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking ''; and that of the eighth'' and inserting ''; that of the eighth''; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: ''; and that of the ninth zone on the one hundred and fiftieth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich.''.

(b) NAME OF ZONE.—Section 4 of the Act of March 19, 1918 (15 U.S.C. 263; commonly known as the Calder Act) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and that of the eighth'' and inserting ''that of the eighth''; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: ''; and that of the ninth zone shall be known as Chamorro standard time''.

(c) DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME.—Section 7 of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 267) is amended by inserting ''Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,'' after ''Puerto Rico,''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3756.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simple and straightforward. The legislation establishes a separate time zone for Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands by increasing the number of standard time zones in the United States from 8 to 9. This new time zone will be known as the Chamorro time zone and will be required to observe daylight savings time.

The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) deserves praise for his tenacity on this issue. It is a simple measure without controversy, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me convey how pleased I am to support this legislation. The bill corrects current law by recognizing that there is a ninth time zone in the United States, namely the time zone followed by the people of Guam and the Northern Marianas.

My colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), I want to salute him today, has corrected this oversight with this bill and has also given the time zone a name, Chamorro standard time.

Chamorro refers to the indigenous people of the area, and I salute my colleague for his creativity by choosing the name Chamorro. The time zone will honor the historic unity of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Marianas and the people who live in the region.

I congratulate the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for his work on this bill; and, of course, I congratulate his staff and all the staff members that have been involved in this.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3756, a bill to name the ninth time zone under U.S. jurisdiction for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

I would also like to take this time to thank my distinguished colleagues who have worked to get this bill to the floor: the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), chairman of the Corrections Day Advisory Committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), ranking member of that same committee.

Wherever the U.S. flag flies, there is a title for each time zone in which it flies, whether it is in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico with its Atlantic time zone; this city, with its eastern time zone; Chicago, with central time; Denver, with mountain time; Los Angeles, with Pacific time; Honolulu, with Hawaii standard time; Anchorage, with Alaska standard time; and even American Samoa, with Samoa standard time. But there is a ninth time zone where Guam sits and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands sits as well; and where there is no official title for this time zone. Not that there is no time there, obviously, but that there is no specific title for this time zone.

Perhaps this is an oversight. The fact that this ninth time zone is on the other side of the international dateline and could appropriately claim the title of being the first American time zone, could get the competitive spirits of those in the Atlantic time zone aroused. But when information is being sent out about changes in national time or announcements concerning time, this ninth time zone, in geography going west but first in terms of time, frequently gets ignored.

After all, the Calder Act, which provides for the designation of names of time zones under U.S. jurisdiction, only names eight time zones.

This bill fills the void of the ninth time zone under U.S. jurisdiction, corrects this oversight, and appropriately designates each and every American time zone.

The unique feature of this particular piece of legislation is that it is responsive to a quandary that does not quite exist in the other time zones. We have two jurisdictions with two distinct names. We could call it the Guam time zone, the Guam/Marianas time zone, but I think over time Marianas would be dropped, or we could call it the Marianas time zone, but that would put out of focus Guam.

Therefore, in honor of the historical unity of both Guam and the Northern Marianas and the people who were the original inhabitants of the entire island chain, I have named this new time zone as Chamorro standard time. The term ''Chamorro'' refers to the indigenous people of Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands and forms the basis of the underlying historical and cultural connection between the people of Guam and the people of Luta, Tinian, Saipan, Agrigan, and other islands in the Northern Marianas.

Mr. Speaker, the administration supports H.R. 3756, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation as well. Esta oran Chamorro.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, let me again congratulate my colleague for the outstanding work that he has done in terms of creating the ninth time zone. I urge my colleagues to support this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3756.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPREME COURT SECURITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5136) to make permanent the authority of the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to provide security beyond the Supreme Court building and grounds.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5136

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

SECTION 1. MAKING PERMANENT CERTAIN POLICING AUTHORITY.

(a) ELIMINATION OF SUNSET PROVISION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 9 of the Act entitled ''An Act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States'', approved August 18, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 13n), is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 9 of such Act is further amended in subsection (b) by striking ''are hereby authorized'' and inserting ''is authorized''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5136.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5136, a bill to make permanent the authority of the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to provide security beyond the Supreme Court building and grounds. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, introduced H.R. 5136 at the request of the Chief Justice of the United States. It was reported by voice vote from the Committee on the Judiciary on September 20.

The Supreme Court Police is charged with enforcing the law at the Supreme Court building and its grounds, as well as protecting Justices and other Court employees off grounds. This authority rests in the United States Code.

Since 1982, Congress has provided statutory authority for the Supreme Court Police to provide security beyond the Court building and grounds for Justices, Court employees, and official visitors. This authority requires that the Supreme Court annually report to Congress on the cost of such security, and it also contains a sunset clause that would cause this authority to lapse if not renewed.

Since 1986, Congress has extended this off-grounds authority four times, but this authority will automatically terminate on December 29, 2000.

The current authority and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court Police are essential to the force's performance of everyday duties. Today the Supreme Court Police regularly provides security to Justices by transporting and accompanying them to official functions in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area and occasionally outside it when they or official guests of the Court are traveling on court business.

Some Justices, because of threats to their personal safety, are driven by the police to and from their homes and the Court every day. Additionally, the police protect Court employees going to and from its parking lot, which is located one half block east of the Supreme Court building and off the ground of the Court.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and I believe that the Supreme Court Police should continue to provide off-ground security to protect the Justices and guests of the Court. Given the fact that the Court's police force is well trained and has an excellent performance record, I think it appropriate that we respond in the affirmative to the Chief Justice's request and make the authority to provide off-ground security permanent.

H.R. 5136 would also eliminate the Court's annual reporting requirement to Congress detailing the administrative cost associated with such protection. This cost has been very modest in the past and is fully detailed each year in the court's annual budget request to Congress.

Finally, H.R. 5136 would also repeal the ministerial requirement that the Chief Justice authorize in writing armed protection for official guests of the Supreme Court when they are traveling in the United States but outside of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important and very reasonable legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as indicated by my colleague, this bill will make permanent the authority of the United States Supreme Court Police to provide security for its Justices, Court employees and official visitors on and off the Supreme Court grounds. The U.S. Supreme Court Police department was first authorized by Congress to carry firearms and protect Court personnel outside the Supreme Court grounds in 1982, and the statutory authority was scheduled to terminate, but Congress has extended such authorization and has done so five additional times. The last extension occurred in October 1996. It is set to expire December 29, 2000.

1615

It is clear that the security concerns that gave rise to the original authorization, including threats of violence against the Justices and the Court, will continue for the foreseeable future.

In addition, I am not aware of any suggestion that they have misused that authority, nor should they not be entitled to such authority on a permanent basis. In fact, the evidence suggests that the Department has discharged its responsibilities in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

For example, the cost of the program has been minimal. The Supreme Court police worked closely with the U.S. Marshal's office to provide security for Supreme Court Justices when they travel outside the Washington, D.C. area. Over the past 4 years, there were 74 requests for that kind of protection beyond the D.C. metropolitan area at a total cost of approximately $17,000, a little more than $4,000 per year.