Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding to me, and certainly want to commend her as the ranking member and the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, for their help on this legislation that I introduced.

Both of my colleagues from Texas have adequately explained the bill, and I certainly commend them for their sense of fairness and justice on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for his very hard work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING TASK FORCE TO RECOMMEND APPROPRIATE RECOGNITION FOR SLAVE LABORERS WHO WORKED ON CONSTRUCTION OF U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 130) establishing a special task force to recommend an appropriate recognition for the slave laborers who worked on the construction of the United States Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 130

Whereas the United States Capitol stands as a symbol of democracy, equality, and freedom to the entire world;

Whereas the year 2000 marks the 200th anniversary of the opening of this historic structure for the first session of Congress to be held in the new Capital City;

Whereas slavery was not prohibited throughout the United States until the ratification of the 13th amendment to the Constitution in 1865;

Whereas previous to that date, African American slave labor was both legal and common in the District of Columbia and the adjoining States of Maryland and Virginia;

Whereas public records attest to the fact that African American slave labor was used in the construction of the United States Capitol;

Whereas public records further attest to the fact that the five-dollar-per-month payment for that African American slave labor was made directly to slave owners and not to the laborer; and

Whereas African Americans made significant contributions and fought bravely for freedom during the American Revolutionary War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall establish a special task force to study the history and contributions of these slave laborers in the construction of the United States Capitol; and

(2) such special task force shall recommend to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate an appropriate recognition for these slave laborers which could be displayed in a prominent location in the United States Capitol.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ''THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL''

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 141) to authorize the printing of copies of the publication entitled ''The United States Capitol'' as a Senate document, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 141

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) a revised edition of the publication entitled ''The United States Capitol'' (referred to as ''the pamphlet'') shall be reprinted as a Senate document.

(b) There shall be printed a total of 2,850,000 copies of the pamphlet in English and seven other languages at a cost not to exceed $165,900 for distribution as follows:

(1)(A) 206,000 copies of the pamphlet in the English language for the use of the Senate with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member;

(B) 886,000 copies of the pamphlet in the English language for the use of the House of Representatives with 2,000 copies distributed to each Member; and

(C) 1,758,000 copies of the pamphlet for distribution to the Capitol Guide Service in the following languages:

(i) 908,000 copies in English;

(ii) 100,000 copies in each of the following seven languages: Spanish, German, French, Russian, Japanese, Italian, and Korean; and

(iii) 150,000 copies in Chinese.

(2) If the total printing and production costs of copies in paragraph (1) exceed $165,900, such number of copies of the pamphlet as does not exceed total printing and production costs of $165,900, shall be printed with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as in paragraph (1) as it relates to numbers of copies in the English language.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1915

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Earlier today, the Chair announced that he would postpone proceedings on a number of motions to suspend the rules until tomorrow. The Chair now announces that he will resume proceedings tonight after consideration of H.R. 4656 on all de novo questions but will postpone any further requests for recorded votes thereon.

LAKE TAHOE BASIN LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 634, I call up the bill (H.R. 4656) to authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Washoe County School District for use as an elementary school site, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 4656 is as follows:

H.R. 4656

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FOREST SERVICE LAND IN THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—Upon application, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, may convey to the Washoe County School District all right, title, and interest of the United States in the property described as a portion of the Northwest quarter of Section 15, Township 16 North, Range 18 East, M.D.B. & M., more particularly described as Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 426 for Boise Cascade, filed in the office of the Washoe County Recorder, State of Nevada, on May 19, 1977, as file No. 465601, Official Records.

(b) REVIEW OF APPLICATION.—When the Secretary receives an application to convey the property under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make a final determination whether or not to convey such property before the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of the application.

(c) USE; REVERSION.—The conveyance of the property under subsection (a) shall be for the sole purpose of the construction of an elementary school on the property. The property conveyed shall revert to the United States if the property is used for a purpose other than as an elementary school site.

(d) CONSIDERATION BASED ON REQUIREMENT TO USE FOR LIMITED PUBLIC PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of any consideration required for the conveyance of property under this section based on the fair market value of the property when it is subject to the restriction on use under subsection (c).

(e) PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the conveyance of the property under subsection (a) shall be available to the Secretary without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended for the purpose of acquiring environmentally sensitive land in the Lake Tahoe Basin pursuant to section 3 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal lands in Nevada and for the acquisition of certain other lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and for other purposes'', approved December 23, 1980 (94 Stat. 3381; commonly known as the ''Santini-Burton Act'').

(f) APPLICABLE LAW.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any sale of National Forest System land under this section shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the conveyance of National Forest System lands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), the author of this legislation, be permitted to control the time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands. And, as well, I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for his support and leadership on this very important bill that is before us this evening.

To my Democratic colleagues on other side of the aisle, let me say this is indeed a very important bill for a rural community in Nevada.

H.R. 4656 will sell, and I want to emphasize that again, ''sell'' 8.7 acres of U.S. Forest Service land inside a developed community, located in the Lake Tahoe Basin, to the Washoe County School District at fair market value for limited use as an elementary school site.

The proceeds of the sale will go towards the purchase of environmentally-sensitive land in the Lake Tahoe region. The site will become the home of an elementary school for 400 children in Incline Village in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, the present site of Incline Elementary School was constructed in 1964 and serves as the only elementary school in the town. Presently, the Incline Elementary School is burdened by serious overcrowding problems, forcing the school to put more than 40 students in a classroom because there is just simply no place else for these children to go.

Due to the school's size limitations, expanding beyond its current physical design is simply not an option.

After reviewing all private and public property in the Incline Village area, the school district, in concert with parents, teachers and community leaders, agreed that the only possible location for a new school would be the 8.7 acres currently owned by the U.S. Forest Service.

This land, Mr. Speaker, was purchased over a decade ago for approximately $500,000 as environmentally-sensitive land under the Santini-Burton Act. However, let me state that this land is not the pristine, beautiful land which one thinks of when thinking about the Lake Tahoe area.

In fact, this 8.7 acres is surrounded by condominium complexes on both sides and a retail shopping mall on the other. Furthermore, the environmentally-sensitive area, which is a seasonal stream which runs through a portion of the land, will be completely protected from development.

In addition, the school district will be installing a water filtration system at the end of the stream channel and the stream will be incorporated into existing educational programs on water quality.

I can confidently state, Mr. Speaker, that any environmental concerns have been fully addressed. As a result, even former Congressman Jim Santini, the author of the Santini-Burton Act, has expressed his support for the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD his letter:

OCTOBER 17, 2000.

Hon. JIM GIBBONS,
House of Representatives, Cannon HOB, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: Recently, I learned that your legislation to convey land in the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Washoe County School District fell twenty-four votes short of passage in the House of Representatives under suspension of the rules. I was disturbed to learn further that much of the contentious debate over your important bill centered around the fact that the land had been acquired under legislation bearing my name, the Santini-Burton Act. Consequently, I felt compelled to write you about this matter and to express my strong support for your legislation, which in no way would threaten the intent, objectives, or goals of the Santini-Burton Act.

The intent of the Santini-Burton Act was to protect environmentally sensitive land from rampant commercial development. However, the opposition to your bill does not reflect the original intent of my legislation in any way. The educational needs of the children of Incline Village, currently crowded into classrooms with over 40 students, must be addressed. Your bill, which was crafted with the input of the League to Save Lake Tahoe, Washoe County School District, and local Forest Service officials, will address these needs while still protecting both the environment and the original intent of my legislation.

Over a decade ago, the U.S. government acquired, as environmentally sensitive land under the Santini-Burton Act, 8.7 acres of land in the Lake Tahoe Basin, for approximately $500,000. The environmental sensitivity of the land stems solely from the seasonal stream bed which runs through a portion of the site. In the years since the federal acquisition, as you know, a condominium development and retail strip mall have been built on the borders of the land. I have also been informed that the next closest U.S. Forest Service owned land is 26 miles away.

Under your bill, H.R. 4656, the Washoe County School District would purchase the 8.7 acres for fair market value for the limited use as an elementary school site to alleviate the overcrowding problems currently burdening the present Incline Elementary School. The environmental sensitivity of the land would be protected, even enhanced, by the addition of water filtration systems and the seasonal stream area would not be disturbed by development. The sensitive area would be incorporated into the school's current curriculum on water quality.

Clearly, the use of this land as an elementary school site would better serve the public than developing the land for any other use—which could garner the full fair market value (perhaps as much as $4 million) for which the Administration so strenuously advocates. It astonishes me that anyone would put such a high price on educating over 400 children.

Jim, please be assured that you have my strong support on this matter. It is my hope that during the debate on this bill the intent of the Santini-Burton Act will no longer be misrepresented. However, my greater hope is that your legislation will pass Congress and be signed into law promptly so that the students of Incline Village can learn in a safe school facility that meets all of their educational needs.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. SANTINI,
Former Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Santini realized the importance of putting education before government profit. In his letter, he states very clearly, ''Clearly, the use of this land as an elementary school site would better serve the public than developing the land for any other use, which could garner the full market value (perhaps as much as $4 million) for which the administration so strenuously advocates. It astonishes me that anyone would put such a high price on educating over 400 children.''

Mr. Speaker, it astonishes me, too, that they would be advocating such a price for this land. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that just this week this administration stated that it has no higher priority than education and yet continues to object to this bill simply because they could get more money for the land if it were commercially developed rather than developed as a school site.

Under this bill, the Federal Government will receive compensation for the land, the environment will be protected, the families of Incline Village will have a school for their children which will encourage education and not inhibit it because of limited space.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4656 is about education. It is about school construction. It is about having that mysterious mythical girl standing in the back of the classroom without room for her desk. And this bill is about children, 400 children as a matter of fact, over 50 percent of whom are ESL students who are learning English as a second language. All of these children deserve a safe and adequate school facility that meets their individual and educational needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fear that if this legislation is not enacted today that the previously fabricated stories that I mentioned earlier about the young girl being forced to stand in the back of the school without her own desk and chair will become a reality in Incline Village.

Voting for H.R. 4656 gives every Member of this House the opportunity to keep their promise and prove their commitment to supporting education. This is good public policy, and it is

government's civic duty to provide education to our children, not to be greedy and price them out of an adequate and healthy learning environment.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, I encourage all Members to vote for H.R. 4656, a bill that is truly a win-win for everybody.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the general concept that is being proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS). But I have to tell the House that I have concerns about the fact that we have had a closed rule that will not allow us to perfect this piece of legislation.

It would sail through, I am convinced, both this House and the other body if we could ensure that this parcel of land was purchased at a price that would allow us then to purchase equivalent land in the Tahoe area. And I think that is at the core of the issue that we are now debating here tonight.

The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), my colleague, spoke earlier on the rule and I think made the case strongly and eloquently that this is not an appropriate way to proceed because these are taxpayer lands and these are taxpayer monies that are at risk here.

I urge my colleague to continue to work with us so that we can continue to perfect the bill and do right by the school system in his State and also do right by the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I have made my views known on this matter. I have a difference of opinion with the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) on whether or not this is a sale at fair market value. I realize the restriction. But I have been over that. It is pretty clear the gentleman has the votes and, so, I will not belabor the point.

I would hope that before this bill finishes its journey that we could do a little bit better by the taxpayers.

H.R. 4656 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convey for fair market value an approximately 8.7 acre parcel on the Tahoe National Forest in Incline Village, NV to the Washoe County School District for use as an elementary school site. The parcel is valued at between $2–4 million. However, because of a deed restriction directing use as a school site and a reversionary clause, the Forest Service believes that the appraised value would be reduced by 75% to approximately $500,000. The bill requires the proceeds of the sale to be used for acquiring environmentally sensitive land in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The parcel, although in a developed area, was originally acquired by the Forest Service in 1981 under the Santini-Burton Act for approximately $500,000. That act authorizes the acquisition of environmentally sensitive land in Lake Tahoe thru sales of BLM land in and near Las Vegas. While the Santini-Burton Act allows transfer of lands or interests in land to state and local government, deed restrictions must protect the environmental quality and public recreation purposes of the land. Legislation is needed in this instance because this conveyance does not fall within the parameters of the Act. While local ordinances may protect the stream on the parcel, nothing in the legislation explicitly protects the stream area from development.

The town sold off a potential school site in 1995 for $855,000. That money, plus a $7.2 million bond issue for construction of the school facility and environmental remediation, would pay for the project.

H.R. 4656 was introduced by Representative GIBBONS on June 14, 2000. A companion measure, S. 2728, was introduced by Senator BRYAN (D–NV) on June 14, 2000. At the September 12, 2000 Committee mark-up, ADAM SMITH offered an amendment that would have removed the deed restriction and reversionary clause thereby allowing the federal government to get full fair market value. The amendment was rejected, the bill was reported out, and the minority filed dissenting views. Over our objections, the bill was placed on the suspension calendar on October 10, 2000 and when a recorded vote was requested, failed on suspension 248–160 on October 12, 2000. In retaliation, the Majority killed Mr. KILDEE's noncontroversial suspension bill (H.R. 468). Now being brought up under a closed rule, we are foreclosed from offering the Smith amendment.

The administration opposes the bill as is, but would support it if it were amended so that the federal government could get fair market value for the land. Were it allowed, the amendment we would have offered simply removes both the deed restriction and the reversionary clause thereby allowing the federal government to get full fair market value for the land. The closed rule prohibits offering the amendment that would get full fair market value for the taxpayers. This is unfair. It's also unfair that the majority killed a noncontroversial bill and failed to reschedule it.

The taxpayers deserve fair compensation for this land in particular, because they purchased the land under a federal program (Santini-Burton) to buy environmentally sensitive land around Lake Tahoe and because the proceeds of the sale will be used to purchase additional environmentally sensitive land in the Lake Tahoe area. Like other land around Lake Tahoe, this land has appreciated considerably in the last 20 years (from $500,000 to several million), and full market value would ensure the government has the ability to replace the land with comparable property. To offset the fiscal and environmental loss of this environmentally valuable property, the federal government should get full value.

The Majority argues that there is precedent for conveying land at less than FMV with a reversionary clause. But in H.R. 695 (San Juan College-T. Udall) and other bills, the land conveyed was simply public domain land or surplus land. H.R. 2890 (Vieques-Crowley) returns land to Puerto Rico that has been used as a bombing range in an effort to restore its environmental integrity. In H.R. 2737 (Lewis and Clark Trail to State of Illinois-Costello), National Park Service land was conveyed for a purpose wholly consistent with the purpose for which the land was acquired (land went to the state to build an interpretive center). Finally, H.R. 1725 (Milwaleta Park Expansion-DeFazio (passed October 23, 2000 on suspension)) conveys park land to be used as park land.

In this bill, the land is not surplus, and it is not being conveyed for a purpose consistent with the purpose for which it was acquired. The land is Santini-Burton land which the public purchased specifically for its environmental value and whose protection represents a federal priority. This bill undermines that act, which, thru restrictions on disposal of property, aims to protect the lands' environmental quality and public recreation purposes. It is sound fiscal policy for the public to receive full value for its public assets. This bill is a sweetheart deal for one school district and is yet another example of using federal lands to subsidize local interests. This is not the solution to school construction problems. It is a rip-off for taxpayers and the environment. The school gets an added windfall because it recently sold a potential school site for $855,000. It also gets not just the property, but the development rights. Unfortunately, this land conveyance is not just an isolated example of a giveaway. It is representative of public lands bills and policies that benefit a few people at the expense of the public.

I have long been concerned that land deals—especially land exchanges—are being cut behind closed doors with tremendous special-interest pressure and limited public input. A General Accounting Office report that I requested confirmed my fears: too many of these exchanges lead to environmental damage and taxpayer rip-offs. The GAO report, ''Land Exchanges Need to Reflect Appropriate Value and Serve the Public Interest,'' released in July found that the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have wasted hundreds of millions of dollars swapping valuable public land for private land of questionable value, and the report concludes that the BLM may even be breaking the law. The GAO reported that the agencies ''did not ensure that the land being exchanged was appropriately valued or that exchanges served the public interest or met certain other exchange requirements.'' GAO went on to state that ''the exchanges presented in our report demonstrate serious, substantive, and continuing problems with the agencies' land exchange programs.''

In addition, GAO found that the BLM has—under the umbrella of its land exchange authority—illegally sold federal land, deposited the proceeds into interest-bearing accounts, and used these funds to acquire nonfederal land (or arranged with others to do so). These unauthorized transactions undermine congressional budget authority, GAO said. Specific findings of the GAO report include:

Private parties in one Nevada exchange made windfall profits, in one case acquiring land ''valued'' by BLM at $763,000 and selling it for $4.6 million on the same day and in another instance acquiring land ''valued'' at $504,000 and selling it for $1 million on the same day.

In the DelMar exchange in Utah, the BLM paid more than seven times the appraised value.

The Forest Service acquired lands in three exchanges in Nevada that were ''overvalued by a total of $8.8 million'' because the appraised values ''were not supported by credible evidence.''

In the Cache Creek exchange in California, the BLM failed to ''present the reasons for acquiring'' the land.

In another Nevada exchange, the Del Webb exchange, BLM removed an agency appraiser and violated the BLM's own policy by hiring a non-federal appraiser recommended by the exchange's private party.

The GAO said the problems were so bad that Congress should consider eliminating the programs altogether. I believe that the appropriate step is to halt the programs and then fix them. in light of the GAO's report, I asked the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to immediately suspend their programs while they evaluate the best method to achieve exchanges' laudable goals. Both agencies declined my request for a moratorium but have begun to review their exchange programs. Although, the reviews may prove to correct many of the problems, I will watch the efforts closely, especially because the BLM continues the land transactions that GAO said were illegal. So now what does this Congress do when faced with a clear demonstration of the problems of the exchange program? Instead of supporting efforts to ensure that taxpayers and the environment are protected, Congress has passed some of the worst land swaps I have seen in my 26 years of Congress.

Since the GAO report was released: The House passed and the President signed into law, S. 1629, the Oregon Land Exchange Act, which mandated the exchange of 90,000 acres without sufficient NEPA review or public disclosure of appraisal information. The House and Senate passed H.R. 4828, the Steens Mountain exchange bill. The bill contains 5 legislated land exchanges. The exchanges were negotiated behind closed doors among a select group of participants. No appraisals were done. Further, while the exchanges themselves are unequal, the ranchers asked for even more and the bill includes nearly $5 million in cash payments to them. As if that was not enough, the bill directs the Secretary to provide fencing and water developments for their grazing operations.

Finally, these trades involve the unprecedented transfer of more than 18,000 acres of wilderness study areas (WSAs) to the ranchers. While it is true that the BLM would receive more than 14,000 acres of private land within WSAs, this is not only a net loss but it also sets a bad precedent of trading wilderness for wilderness. Further, significant private inholdings will remain in the proposed wilderness areas even after these trades.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), and to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that those perfecting amendments they were talking about were, of course, removing the restrictions for the limitation of using this property only as a school site and also to remove the restriction of a reversionary clause, which would be that, if it were not used for a school, it would be reverted back to the Federal Government.

Those provisions are in the bill; and to remove those, of course, would allow for the appraisal process to be one which would garner that of a commercially developed piece of property. This school district is not interested in developing this property as commercial property. It certainly wants to use the property for a school site. It is going to protect the environment.

Let me also say to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), over here that his support of H.R. 695, which is a bill that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL) supported not long ago to acquire land for San Juan College, was sold and acquired with a restriction to be used for educational purposes, which, of course, had an effect on the valuation of it.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of bills that have been passed through this body with the support of the other side that have not been raised on the issue of fairness to the taxpayer that actually gave property away and let Federal taxpayers receive zero, zip, nada, nothing for the property that was given away; and those are clearly on record here. I can go through and cite many of those bills, Mr. Speaker.

But this is an important piece of legislation for the education of some children. We are asking for the fair market value based on the use of the land as an educational site. It was acquired for $500,000. I think with the restrictions placed on it that we could actually give back to the taxpayers the money they paid for it and maybe even a little extra, depending upon the valuation of that property.

But this is an important bill for the education of those children. We want to have an opportunity to give these children up there a place to go to school. The nearest, closest land that could be suitable for a school for an elementary school site in the area is about 26 miles away. Otherwise, these schoolchildren will have to be bussed over a mountainous pass in the wintertime, which is oftentimes closed by snow and ice, a very dangerous road in the wintertime.

It is the safety of these children, it is the education of these children that we are so very, very much concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, noting that my good friends on the other side of the aisle have been gracious, and I do have great respect for their opinions, I would ask that all of my colleagues support this legislation.

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

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

The bill is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 634, the previous question is ordered.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1930

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on all de novo questions on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2413, de novo;
H.R. 4940, de novo;
S. 1865, de novo; and
S. 1453, de novo.

COMPUTER SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2413, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2413, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4940, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICA'S LAW ENFORCEMENT AND MENTAL HEALTH PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1865.