United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2001 No. 116

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1885. An act to expand the class of beneficiaries who may apply for adjustment of status under section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by extending the deadline for classification petition and labor certification filings, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 149. An act to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the tenth annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MICHAEL E. RYAN

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to rise to pay tribute to a great American, General Michael E. Ryan, the chief of staff of the United States Air Force. His departure on September 6 last week from active duty signaled an evolutionary change: the first time in 63 years, if you can believe that, that a Ryan is absent from the roles of the United States Air Force. His father, General John Ryan, also served as a senior uniformed Air Force officer.

General Mike Ryan's career spanned over 3 decades during which he distinguished himself as an airman leader and trusted advisor to both the President and the United States Congress.

After graduating from the Air Force Academy in 1965, General Ryan began his illustrious career of faithful service to this Nation.

During his 36 years of service, he commanded at the squadron, wing, numbered air force and major command levels. He flew combat missions in southeast Asia, including 100 missions over north Vietnam.

He was a fighter pilot, I can tell you that. I was one, too; and he was a fighter pilot's fighter pilot.

He also served in key assignments at the major command level, headquarters of the United States Air Force and the joint staff right here in Washington, DC.

As commander of the 16th Air Force and allied forces southern Europe in Italy, he directed the NATO air combat operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina that directly contributed to the Dayton peace accords. He was the head of the Air Force at the time when we used the B–2 bomber to great effectiveness in that war.

General Ryan is a command pilot with more than 4,100 hours flying time in seven different aircraft, including 153 combat missions.

His decorations and medals include: the Defense Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster; the Distinguished Service Medal; the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters; the Distinguished Flying Cross; the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters; the Air Medal with 11 oak leaf clusters; the Air Force Commendation Medal with two oak leaf clusters; and the Vietnam Service Medal with three service stars.

After serving as the commander of the United States Air Force in Europe and commander of the allied air forces in central Europe, General Ryan took the stick of the Air Force as its 16th chief of staff.

He has exemplified the quiet dignity and honor of that office. His leadership, integrity and foresight set the right vector for our 21st century Air Force, and his expeditionary force concept is now in being.

History has proven that a true leader sets the right vector and then clears the path to allow his commanders to truly command their units.

General Ryan personifies this type of leader, and I quote, ''I do not think leadership should be personalized. Good ideas are best when they do not have a single identity. Leadership is a team effort.''

I want to take a moment, if I can, to identify the remarkable accomplishments of General Ryan's team effort.

He and his leadership team have successfully arrested the Air Force readiness decline of the last decade. They

Printed on recycled paper.

have built stability into the expeditionary operations our Nation demands by reorganizing the United States Air Force.

He has led the Air Force retention and recruiting effort that ensured quality was never sacrificed for quantity in an all-volunteer force competing in a strong job market.

He led the effort to provide lifetime health care and a retirement system that properly compensates the member's service to his country. He was a people person, and he believed in the people that were in the United States Air Force.

In a period of leadership challenges, General Ryan led our Air Force through 4 tumultuous years, balancing reduction in force with increased operational tasking.

Without question, the United States Air Force is the world's premier aerospace force, and our country owes a debt of gratitude to General Mike Ryan.

One key contributor to the U.S. Air Force ''One family, one Air Force'' and a person General Ryan owes much of his success to is his wife, Jane Ryan, who was instrumental in dealing with the personnel problems of the military throughout the Air Force.

With dignity and grace, she selflessly gave her time and attention to the men and women of the Air Force family. Her sacrifice and devotion served as an example and inspiration for others.

The Air Force lost not one but two very exceptional people.

Last Thursday's review ceremony at Andrews Air Force Base was a demonstration of the total force concept that exemplified the superb ability of our airmen and officers that General Ryan has led and improved during his tenure.

Those F–4D that flew by were a symbol of his career as fighter pilot and his combat excellence. He actually flew in an F–16 the day before.

In closing, the Air Force is a better institution today than it was 4 years ago. General Ryan's distinguished and faithful service provided a significant and lasting contribution to our Air Force and our Nation's security.

He has served our Nation with honor and distinction. I know the Members of both the House and Senate join me in paying tribute to this outstanding American patriot upon his retirement from the United States Air Force.

We thank him, wish him and his family much health, happiness and God speed.

General Ryan, good flight, mission complete.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Out of the depths, David cries to You, O Lord, in Psalm 130.

Lord, on an ordinary September Monday, caught up in routine, it may be difficult for us to be in touch with our depths.

Yet when aware of the pain in some hearts or when we truly face the complexity of issues overshadowing our responsibilities, we need Your mercy.

Help us to sense Your forgiveness behind every mistaken judgment of the past.

Guide our decisions today and throughout this week, that much may be accomplished and be recognized as Your providential care behind every event.

For it is Your justice and Your peace which holds the aspirations of the American people together.

Longing for Your presence, O Lord, make us watchful for Your movements and personal reflection and in honest discussion, so Your glory may be evident in our deeds.

By Your grace penetrate our souls, that we may live and pray from the depths now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

U.N. CONFERENCE ON RACISM

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the most recent issue of the Weekly Standard features a Charles Krauthammer article entitled Disgrace in Durbin, referring to the recently concluded U.N. Conference on Racism.

Mr. Krauthammer suggests that their conference included Third World dictators practicing their demagoguery, hopefully to the detriment of Israel.

He further suggests that the conference had the trappings reminiscent of pre-World War II in Nazi Germany, a Nuremberg rally, if you will, and these same dictators were pointing indirectly or directly accusatory fingers at the United States because of our friendship with Israel.

This sort of activity serves no good purpose, and President Bush is to be commended for his refusal to legitimize or dignify the disgrace in Durbin.

AMERICA NEEDS IMMEDIATE CAPITAL GAINS TAX RELIEF

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today the United States is burdened with one of the highest capital gains taxes of any industrial nation. The effect puts our country's companies and workers at a severe disadvantage.

On average, the capital of U.S. businesses and farmers is taxed 80 percent higher than our foreign competitors. The economy needs and those who we represent deserve immediate capital gains tax relief.

The capital gains tax is an assault on the American dream. For many low- and moderate-income workers, one of the ways of accumulating wealth is through investment in stocks and businesses.

When the government puts a high tax on capital gains, people who lose the most from the high rate are the poorest, the youngest, those in the beginning of their careers, those who are further from the sources of capital.

Policies that punish success ultimately kill the seeds that promise enterprise and jobs to the poor. Those in our communities are asking for our help, Mr. Speaker.

Their message to us, to the President, and all in this Congress could not be clearer: give us the seed capital for inner-city jobs and investments. Turn this economy around, cut capital gains and cut capital gains taxes now.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TOM SAWYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TOM SAWYER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Court of Common Pleas of Summit County, Ohio.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

TOM SAWYER.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes or postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

OIL REGION NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 695) to establish the Oil Region National Heritage Area, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 695

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Oil Region National Heritage Area Act''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) HERITAGE AREA.—The term ''Heritage Area'' means the Oil Region National Heritage Area established in section 3(a).

(2) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The term ''management entity'' means the Oil Heritage Region, Inc., or its successor entity.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Oil Region of Northwestern Pennsylvania, with numerous sites and districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and designated by the Governor of Pennsylvania as one of the State Heritage Park Areas, is a region with tremendous physical and natural resources and possesses a story of State, national, and international significance.

(2) The single event of Colonel Edwin Drake's drilling of the world's first successful oil well in 1859 has affected the industrial, natural, social, and political structures of the modern world.

(3) Six national historic districts are located within the State Heritage Park boundary, in Emlenton, Franklin, Oil City, and Titusville, as well as 17 separate National Register sites.

(4) The Allegheny River, which was designated as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system in 1992 by Public Law 102–271, traverses the Oil Region and connects several of its major sites, as do some of the river's tributaries such as Oil Creek, French Creek, and Sandy Creek.

(5) The unspoiled rural character of the Oil Region provides many natural and recreational resources, scenic vistas, and excellent water quality for people throughout the United States to enjoy.

(6) Remnants of the oil industry, visible on the landscape to this day, provide a direct link to the past for visitors, as do the historic valley settlements, riverbed settlements, plateau developments, farmlands, and industrial landscapes.

(7) The Oil Region also represents a cross section of American history associated with Native Americans, frontier settlements, the French and Indian War, African Americans and the Underground Railroad, and immigration of Swedish and Polish individuals, among others.

(8) Involvement by the Federal Government shall serve to enhance the efforts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, local subdivisions of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, volunteer organizations, and private businesses, to promote the cultural, national, and recreational resources of the region in order to fulfill their full potential.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to enhance a cooperative management framework to assist the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, its units of local government, and area citizens in conserving, enhancing, and interpreting the significant features of the lands, water, and structures of the Oil Region, in a manner consistent with compatible economic development for the benefit and inspiration of present and future generations in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States.

SEC. 3. OIL REGION NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Oil Region National Heritage Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the Heritage Area shall include all of those lands depicted on a map entitled ''Oil Region National Heritage Area'', numbered OIRE/20,000 and dated October, 2000. The map shall be on file in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service. The Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register, as soon as practical after the date of the enactment of this Act, a detailed description and map of the boundaries established under this subsection.

(c) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Oil Heritage Region, Inc., the locally based private, nonprofit management corporation which shall oversee the development of a management plan in accordance with section 5(b).

SEC. 4. COMPACT.

To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the area, including a discussion of the goals and objectives of the Heritage Area, including an explanation of the proposed approach to conservation and interpretation and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the Secretary and management entity.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.

(a) AUTHORITIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity may use funds made available under this Act for purposes of preparing, updating, and implementing the management plan developed under subsection (b). Such purposes may include—

(1) making grants to, and entering into cooperative agreements with, States and their political subdivisions, private organizations, or any other person;

(2) hiring and compensating staff; and

(3) undertaking initiatives that advance the purposes of the Heritage Area.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management entity shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Area that—

(1) presents comprehensive strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

(2) takes into consideration existing State, county, and local plans and involves residents, public agencies, and private organizations working in the Heritage Area;

(3) includes a description of actions that units of government and private organizations have agreed to take to protect the resources of the Heritage Area;

(4) specifies the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area;

(5) includes an inventory of the resources contained in the Heritage Area, including a list of any property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of its natural, cultural, historic, recreational, or scenic significance;

(6) recommends policies for resource management which consider and detail application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including, but not limited to, the development of intergovernmental and interagency cooperative agreements to protect the Heritage Area's historical, cultural, recreational, and natural resources in a manner consistent with supporting appropriate and compatible economic viability;

(7) describes a program for implementation of the management plan by the management entity, including plans for restoration and construction, and specific commitments for that implementation that have been made by the management entity and any other persons for the first 5 years of implementation;

(8) includes an analysis of ways in which local, State, and Federal programs, including the role for the National Park Service in the Heritage Area, may best be coordinated to promote the purposes of this Act;

(9) lists any revisions to the boundaries of the Heritage Area proposed by the management entity and requested by the affected local government; and

(10) includes an interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.

(c) DEADLINE; TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—

(1) DEADLINE.—The management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary within 2 years after the funds are made available for this Act.

(2) TERMINATION OF FUNDING.—If a management plan is not submitted to the Secretary in accordance with this subsection, the management entity shall not qualify for Federal assistance under this Act.

(d) DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity shall—

(1) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the compact and management plan;

(2) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in—

(A) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area;

(B) developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;

(C) increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area;

(D) the restoration of any historic building relating to the themes of the Heritage Area;

(E) ensuring that clear, consistent, and environmentally appropriate signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Heritage Area; and

(F) carrying out other actions that the management entity determines to be advisable to fulfill the purposes of this Act;

(3) encourage by appropriate means economic viability in the Heritage Area consistent with the goals of the management plan;

(4) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area; and

(5) for any year in which Federal funds have been provided to implement the management plan under subsection (b)—

(A) conduct public meetings at least annually regarding the implementation of the management plan;

(B) submit an annual report to the Secretary setting forth accomplishments, expenses and income, and each person to which any grant was made by the management entity in the year for which the report is made; and

(C) require, for all agreements entered into by the management entity authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by any other person, that the person making the expenditure make available to the management entity for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds.

(e) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or an interest in real property.

SEC. 6. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY.

(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) OVERALL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may, upon the request of the management entity, and subject to the availability of appropriations, provide technical and financial assistance to the management entity to carry out its duties under this Act, including updating and implementing a management plan that is submitted under section 5(b) and approved by the Secretary and, prior to such approval, providing assistance for initiatives.

(B) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—If the Secretary has the resources available to provide technical assistance to the management entity to carry out its duties under this Act (including updating and implementing a management plan that is submitted under section 5(b) and approved by the Secretary and, prior to such approval, providing assistance for initiatives), upon the request of the management entity the Secretary shall provide such assistance on a reimbursable basis. This subparagraph does not preclude the Secretary from providing nonreimbursable assistance under subparagraph (A).

(2) PRIORITY.—In assisting the management entity, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that assist in the—

(A) implementation of the management plan;

(B) provision of educational assistance and advice regarding land and water management techniques to conserve the significant natural resources of the region;

(C) development and application of techniques promoting the preservation of cultural and historic properties;

(D) preservation, restoration, and reuse of publicly and privately owned historic buildings;

(E) design and fabrication of a wide range of interpretive materials based on the management plan, including guide brochures, visitor displays, audio-visual and interactive exhibits, and educational curriculum materials for public education; and

(F) implementation of initiatives prior to approval of the management plan.

(3) DOCUMENTATION OF STRUCTURES.—The Secretary, acting through the Historic American Building Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record, shall conduct studies necessary to document the industrial, engineering, building, and architectural history of the Heritage Area.

(b) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Pennsylvania, shall approve or disapprove a management plan submitted under this Act not later than 90 days after receiving such plan. In approving the plan, the Secretary shall take into consideration the following criteria:

(1) The extent to which the management plan adequately preserves and protects the natural, cultural, and historical resources of the Heritage Area.

(2) The level of public participation in the development of the management plan.

(3) The extent to which the board of directors of the management entity is representative of the local government and a wide range of interested organizations and citizens.

(c) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a management plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval and shall make recommendations for revisions in the management plan. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 90 days after the date it is submitted.

(d) APPROVING CHANGES.—The Secretary shall review and approve amendments to the management plan under section 5(b) that make substantial changes. Funds appropriated under this Act may not be expended to implement such changes until the Secretary approves the amendments.

(e) EFFECT OF INACTION.—If the Secretary does not approve or disapprove a management plan, revision, or change within 90 days after it is submitted to the Secretary, then such management plan, revision, or change shall be deemed to have been approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 7. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.

Any Federal entity conducting or supporting activities directly affecting the Heritage Area shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary and the management entity with respect to such activities;

(2) cooperate with the Secretary and the management entity in carrying out their duties under this Act and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate such activities with the carrying out of such duties; and

(3) to the maximum extent practicable, conduct or support such activities in a manner that the management entity determines shall not have an adverse effect on the Heritage Area.

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

The Secretary may not make any grant or provide any assistance under this Act after the expiration of the 15-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall preclude the management entity from using Federal funds available under Acts other than this Act for the purposes for which those funds were authorized.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

(1) not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year; and

(2) not more than a total of $10,000,000.

(b) 50 PERCENT MATCH.—Financial assistance provided under this Act may not be used to pay more than 50 percent of the total cost of any activity carried out with that assistance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am delighted to be here today to discuss H.R. 695, The Oil Region National Heritage Area. I would first like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and their staff for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor today. This legislation is vital to protect and conserve natural, cultural, and historical resources of national significance, while recognizing one of the single most influential resources of the modern era.

The 1859 event of Colonel Edwin Drake's drilling of the world's first successful oil well has had a tremendous effect on the modern world. The commercial history of petroleum in the United States begins at Drake Well located along Oil Creek near Titusville, Pennsylvania, in fact, 5 miles from my home. The tools, the terminology, and the transportation and financial and extraction processes of the oil industry were developed here in the latter part of the 19th century and are still used today. Oil and petroleum products have transformed the world, including the automobile, the industrial revolution, and the creation of petroleum-based products such as plastics.

Oil has been recognized as a potentially significant substance long before Drake's Well called the attention of the world to this corner of Northwestern Pennsylvania. Many accounts of the Allegheny valleys and its tributaries tell of springs and streams whose surfaces were covered with a thick, oily substance. Because of this, the Oil Creek Valley was so named even before Drake's well. In addition, Native Americans of the Seneca tribe gathered and traded oil, giving rise to the name ''Seneca Oil.'' About 1847, a Pennsylvanian named Sam Keir devised a way to distill petroleum into lamp fuel which he called ''carbon fuel.'' The discovery of oil caused a stampede of people, with whole towns and hundreds of new oil wells quickly appearing.

Familiar words and meanings in the American language originated or were adopted for use in this territory: wildcatter, bird dog, gusher, pay dirt, shooter, and cash on the barrel head. Heroes and villains, enormous wealth, tragedies, violence, and environmental degradation are part of this story.

Forests were clear-cut to provide railroad ties and material to build oil derricks, bridges and buildings. Early black and white pictures show a deneutered landscape devoid of any trees or foliage. Part of the story that visitors learn about when they visit the current area of the Oil Heritage Park includes the degradation and restoration of the forests. Now, the visitors can see vistas of restored forests, creeks, and ecosystems. When I was a boy, you could not swim in many of these streams. Now we have some of the best trout and bass fishing in the East. I am grateful technology has improved over the years so that we can manage our natural resources in a way that is beneficial to all.

The creation of the Oil Region National Heritage Area enjoys widespread support from local citizens, governments, and businesses. Last year, the National Park Service testified about their reluctance to create this heritage area. However, at my urging, they agreed to conduct a feasibility study. The team went into this study with trepidation; however, they came away supportive and enthusiastic about the creation of the Oil Region National Heritage Area.

In February, we conducted two town hall meetings where elected officials, community leaders, businesses and concerned citizens met to discuss the merits of the national designation. No negative comments were voiced concerning the creation of the Oil Region

National Heritage Area. Sixty-eight people attended the meetings and every person who commented spoke favorably. As my colleagues can see, Mr. Speaker, this endeavor was founded with true grassroots support.

Today, Pennsylvania is no longer a major contributor in U.S. oil production; however, hundreds of active wells still dot the landscape. Oil Creek and its tributaries now run clear. Hillsides that once were oil soaked and clear-cut now exist as mature forests. All of the major oil companies have their roots here, including Sunoco, Standard Oil, Pennzoil, Quaker State, and Texaco. Oil fueled the industrial revolution and modernized America's transportation system. It is vital that we preserve and enhance the area that is called ''the valley that changed the world,'' the birthplace of commercial petroleum.

Through the establishment of the Oil Region National Heritage Area, we are allowing this great story to be told through maintenance of exhibits, restoration of buildings, and the development of educational and recreational opportunities. I would like to thank the cosponsors of H.R. 695, including my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), a neighbor. In fact, the majority of the Pennsylvania delegation supports the creation of the Oil Region National Heritage Area, and I would like to thank them as well. This bill is supported by the majority and minority party of the Committee on Resources as well as the administration. It is indeed now time to recognize the national significance of this great region by designating the Oil Region as a National Heritage Area. I hope my colleagues will want to recognize the important contribution that oil has made to the world as we know it by voting to pass H.R. 695, the Oil Region National Heritage Area. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 695, as amended.

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

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would establish a new national heritage area in Pennsylvania. The purpose of the new designation would be to commemorate the first successful efforts to drill for oil in the mid-19th century and to preserve historical and cultural resources of the time. The area included in this new designation is already home to six national historic districts and 17 sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Similar legislation in the previous Congress raised some concern because, at the time, no study of the area to be included in this new designation had been conducted. In addition, the administration raised several technical issues regarding the bill. However, since that time, a study has been completed and the area was found to be appropriate for this type of designation. Further, the sponsor of the bill has made the changes suggested by the administration and, with those changes, we join the administration in supporting H.R. 695.

□ 1415

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 695, 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.

EL CAMINO REAL DE LOS TEJAS NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL ACT OF 2001

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1628) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1628

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) El Camino Real de los Tejas (the Royal Road to the Tejas), served as the primary route between the Spanish viceregal capital of Mexico City and the Spanish provincial capital of Tejas at Los Adaes (1721–1773) and San Antonio (1773–1821);

(2) the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth century rivalries among the European colonial powers of Spain, France, and England and after their independence, Mexico and the United States, for dominion over lands fronting the Gulf of Mexico, were played out along the evolving travel routes in this immense area;

(3) the future of several American Indian nations, whose prehistoric trails were later used by the Spaniards for exploration and colonization, was tied to these larger forces and events and the nations were fully involved in and affected by the complex cultural interactions that ensued;

(4) the Old San Antonio Road was a series of routes established in the early 19th century sharing the same corridor and some routes of El Camino Real, and carried American immigrants from the east, contributing to the formation of the Republic of Texas, and its annexation to the United States;

(5) the exploration, conquest, colonization, settlement, migration, military occupation, religious conversion, and cultural exchange that occurred in a large area of the borderland was facilitated by El Camino Real de los Tejas as it carried Spanish and Mexican influences northeastward, and by its successor, the Old San Antonio Road, which carried American influence westward, during a historic period which extended from 1689 to 1850; and

(6) the portions of El Camino Real de los Tejas in what is now the United States extended from the Rio Grande near Eagle Pass and Laredo, Texas and involved routes that changed through time, that total almost 2,600 miles in combined length, generally coursing northeasterly through San Antonio, Bastrop, Nacogdoches, and San Augustine in Texas to Natchitoches, Louisiana, a general corridor distance of 550 miles.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

Section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a) is amended as follows:

(1) By designating the paragraph relating to the Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail as paragraph (21).

(2) By adding at the end the following:

''(23) EL CAMINO REAL DE LOS TEJAS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—El Camino Real de los Tejas (The Royal Road to the Tejas) National Historic Trail, a combination of routes totaling 2,580 miles in length from the Rio Grande near Eagle Pass and Laredo, Texas to Natchitoches, Louisiana, and including the Old San Antonio Road, as generally depicted on the maps entitled 'El Camino Real de los Tejas', contained in the report prepared pursuant to subsection (b) entitled 'National Historic Trail Feasibility Study and Environmental Assessment: El Camino Real de los Tejas, Texas-Louisiana', dated July 1998. A map generally depicting the trail shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The trail shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

''(B) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Interior may coordinate with United States and Mexican public and non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, and, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Government of Mexico and its political subdivisions, for the purpose of exchanging trail information and research, fostering trail preservation and educational programs, providing technical assistance, and working to establish an international historic trail with complementary preservation and education programs in each nation.''.

SEC. 4. PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTION.

Designation of El Camino Real de los Tejas under this Act does not itself confer any additional authority to apply other existing Federal laws and regulations on non-Federal lands along the trail. Laws or regulations requiring public entities and agencies to take into consideration a national historic trail shall continue to apply notwithstanding the foregoing. On non-Federal lands, the national historic trail shall be established only when landowners voluntarily request certification of their sites and segments of the trail consistent with section 3(a)(3) of the National Trails System Act. Notwithstanding section 7(g) of such Act, the United States is authorized to acquire privately-owned real property or an interest in such property for purposes of the trail only with the willing consent of the owner of such property and shall have no authority to condemn or otherwise appropriate privately-owned real property or an interest in such property for the purposes of El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1828 would establish the El Camino Real de los Tejas National Trail to the National Trails system. The Camino Real, also known as the royal road, is a combination of historic routes totaling 2,600 miles used by the Spanish to connect them to Spanish Capitals. The history of the trail extends from early American Indian nations to modern exploration and colonization.

Today, the trail extends from the Texas-Mexico border along the Rio Grande River to Natchitoches, Louisiana. These roads were primary transportation routes starting in the 1600s, and thus had significant influences on the culture and political identity of south central Texas and western Louisiana.

In addition to the designation as a National Historic Trail, H.R. 1628 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate an international effort to recognize the significance of this trail, and foster education and research of its history with the country of Mexico.

Finally, H.R. 1628 specifies that the acquisition of privately-owned land or interest in land would occur only with the consent of the owner.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1628 is supported by the majority and the minority, as well as the administration. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1628.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a study authorized by the 103rd Congress found that the El Camino Real de los Tejas was eligible for designation as a National Historic Trail under criteria established by the National Trails System Act, H.R. 1628, which will officially add this new route to our National Trails System.

The trail would be comprised of several different and overlapping routes totaling more than 2,500 miles. Beginning on the U.S.-Mexican border between the Texas cities of Eagle Pass and Laredo, the trail would run across Texas through cities including San Antonio and Austin, and end in the town of Natchitoches, Louisiana.

These routes were established around 1860 during the Spanish colonial period and remained in use through the early 1880s. During that time, these trails played a significant role in the settlement and economic development of the Texas frontier during the Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo-American periods.

This legislation makes clear that the trail may only be established with the consent of any affected private landowners, and mandates that any land acquisition for trail purposes may be from willing sellers only.

We commend our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), and are pleased to support him for his hard work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1628.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to ask the House to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1628, the Camino Real de los Tejas Historic Trails Act of 2001. This legislation would designate a series of historic trails dating back to the 1600s as National Historic Trails. These trails, used first by the Native Americans, became the primary travel routes for exploration and then for commercial routes for the Spanish, the Mexicans, the Texans, and the Americans.

Before I go any further, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to express my sincere thanks to the chairman and to the committee for their hard work; and to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for their hard work in bringing the bill to the floor today.

The Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands has been very supportive. I would like to thank its chairman, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN). I appreciate the bipartisan support that the committee has provided.

The El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trails Act has received tremendous support from local governments and community organizations all across the State of Texas. More than 60 cities, counties, and local organizations from all over the border, from Mexico into Louisiana, have passed formal resolutions endorsing the passage of this legislation.

I owe a special thanks to the Alamo Area Council of Governments for its leadership in working on this with the National Park Service, with me and my office, and with local governments along the trail route for the more than 3 years they have worked on this legislation. Without their hard work, we would not be here today.

The National Park Service completed its feasibility study in July of 1998 pursuant to Public Law 103–145. The study concluded that the proposed trail met all the applicable criteria in the National Trails System Act, Public Law 90–543. In the 105th Congress, the Senate passed similar legislation, the El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 1998, Senate bill 2276, but the Congress ended before the House had the opportunity to consider the legislation.

The bill before the House today contains a number of important changes in the version passed by the Senate in the 105th Congress. In an effort to clarify the intent of the legislation and to respond to concerns raised by private property owners and advocates during the bill's consideration, H.R. 1628 contains specific provisions to ensure protection by private property rights, as our chairman has indicated.

Specifically, the bill states unambiguously that no land or interest in land can be acquired by the Federal Government without the willing consent of the owner; secondly, that the Federal Government has no authority to condemn or appropriate land for the trail; that the trail would not be established on the ground unless a private property owner voluntarily requests to participate; and that the designation of the trail does not confer any additional authority to apply other nontrail Federal laws that might be implicationable.

These provisions reflect my desire to remove any concerns that the National Historic Trail in Texas would negatively impact on private property owners. In fact, the experience of other existing national historic trails suggests just the opposite. Private property owners can and do benefit from participation in the trail program, but only if they so choose.

The trail that will be designated today is truly historic. The Camino Real, or Royal Highway, forged the way for the early development of Texas from the Spanish colony to an independent Republic as a State of the United States and as the first great highway of Texas. This Camino Real opened the door to trade and cultural exchange, which continues to impact our lives today.

The State of Texas recognized the critical importance of these royal highways in 1929 when the State legislature designated portions of the El Camino Real de los Tejas, later known as the Old San Antonio Road, as one of Texas's historic trails.

State Highway 21 marks the trail's pathway in many parts of the State, as do State historical markers. Designation as a National Historic Trail would greatly enhance the resources available for trail preservation and public education of its unique and important history.

The Camino Real de los Tejas, as defined in this legislation collectively, represents a series of roads and trails extending for over 1,000 miles from Mexico City to Los Adeas in what is today Louisiana, beginning with the Indian trails. Remember, this goes back, it is a beautiful history, to 1689 and the explorers as well as missionaries and people who colonized the area.

All told, various portions of this El Camino Real de los Tejas now extends up to 550, and some up to 2,600, miles as they paralleled each other with various roads.

The Camino Real de los Tejas linked the Spanish in Mexico to their new outposts in East Texas in the late 17th and 18th century. The mission San Antonio de Valero, later known as the Alamo, was established along the Camino Real route and later served as a

focal point for military battles for Texas independence. Critical supplies made their way to the American Colonies during the war of independence via the Camino Real de los Tejas trail system.

The El Camino Real de los Tejas road system provided many transportation routes for Mexican and Texan armies during the Texas revolution, and continued to play a major role in the military future of the area.

Recognizing the significance of El Camino Real de los Tejas and its historical importance grounds us for the future and provides us great opportunities for today. The trail's designation will help enhance tourism and economic development for many of the small cities that it goes through, and for the towns and trails that it passes through. The local museums as well as historical sites will give new opportunities for growth.

The San Antonio Missions National Historic Park and the importance of the beautification network of the mission in San Antonio will provide a base for operation of the trail. The number of public roads, State parks, and national forests can also provide public access to this important piece of our history.

As we strive to boost international trade and development of our local communities, as well as enhance educational opportunities, we only have to look to the El Camino Real de los Tejas for inspiration.

I can just add once again, I thank the gentleman very much. We always talk about the westward movement. We forget there was a northward movement also, and a southern movement.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1628, the Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for his leadership on this legislation, as well as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Land, and its ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

This trail runs through my hometown of Crockett, as well as several other communities in my district, such as Nacogdoches and Augustine. It is a very historic part of our State in East Texas. I am proud to represent the congressional district once represented by Sam Houston.

This historic highway system, which has served Texas for over 150 years, was, beginning in 1689, one of the primary exploration, commerce, and immigration routes through our great State of Texas. The highway, as has been mentioned, extends from Mexico across the Rio Grande all the way up through East Texas into Louisiana. The trail covers over 2,600 miles in all.

I have received resolutions in favor of this legislation from numerous communities along the trail urging that this highway be designated as a National Historic Trail, so I am proud to join with my colleagues here on the floor today advocating that the House adopt H.R. 1628 to designate the El Camino Real as a National Historic Trail.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to share with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) that we are delighted to support his bill, and urge fellow Members to do likewise.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1628, the El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 2001. I want to commend my colleague, Representative CIRO RODRIGUEZ of Texas for introducing this bill.

H.R. 1628, the El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 2001, is a good bill because it provides for the protection and conservation of our cultural heritage. The enactment of H.R. 1628 will serve to continue recognizing the cultural heritage and preservation of the Southwest United States. The measure will also go a long way in strengthening the many common ties between the United States and Mexico that are symbolized by and embodied in the Camino Reales of the Southwest.

The El Camino Real de los Tejas has connected the people of Mexico and the United States in transportation and commerce. This bill would help recognize and designate this network of trade routes, post routes, cattle trails and military highways used by Native Americans, Spanish, French and English explorers. Moreover, this bill illustrates the historical importance of these corridors and will contribute to the enhancement of tourism and economic development throughout the region.

Designating El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail will, undoubtedly reconnect our citizens even more closely to the ties of historical and cultural heritage with Mexico and Spain. Revitalizing the Camino Real de los Tejas will also allow the larger family of Americans to participate in and benefit from that effort. It will lead to a more rounded, more holistic view of the history of our continent, one that will enable us to continue to discover and explore the commonalities that bond the U.S. with Mexico and Spain.

Last year, Representative SYLVESTRE REYES and I sponsored similar legislation that was signed by President Clinton. That measure designated El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, which ran from El Paso, Texas to San Juan Pueblo in New Mexico as a National Historic Trail.

H.R. 1628 is equally important to the preservation of our cultural resources. Again, I commend Mr. RODRIGUEZ for introducing this legislation and urge my colleagues to support it.

I hope that together through efforts like this, we can continue to expand cultural heritage preservation and tourism initiatives throughout the Southwest. In doing so, we celebrate our rich cultural history while expanding economic opportunities.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1628.

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.

EMIGRANT WILDERNESS PRESERVATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 434) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a cooperative agreement to provide for retention, maintenance, and operation, at private expense, of the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 434

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emigrant Wilderness Preservation Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN WATER IMPOUNDMENT STRUCTURES IN THE EMIGRANT WILDERNESS, STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a cooperative agreement with a non-Federal entity described in subsection (c), under which the entity will retain, maintain, and operate at private expense the water impoundment structures specified in subsection (b) that are located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, as designated by section 2(b) of Public Law 93–632 (88 Stat. 2154; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note).

(b) COVERED WATER IMPOUNDMENT STRUCTURES.—The cooperative agreement required by subsection (a) shall cover the water impoundment structures located at the following:

(1) Cow Meadow Lake.
(2) Y-Meadow Lake.
(3) Huckleberry Lake.
(4) Long Lake.
(5) Lower Buck Lake.
(6) Leighton Lake.
(7) High Emigrant Lake.
(8) Emigrant Meadow Lake.
(9) Middle Emigrant Lake.
(10) Emigrant Lake.
(11) Snow Lake.
(12) Bigelow Lake.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The following non-Federal entities are eligible to enter into the cooperative agreement under subsection (a):

(1) A non-profit organization as defined in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).

(2) The State of California or a political subdivision of the State.

(3) A private individual, organization, corporation, or other legal entity.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—

(1) MAP.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a map identifying the location, size,

and type of each water impoundment structure covered by the cooperative agreement under subsection (a).

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall prescribe the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement, which shall set forth the rights and obligations of the Secretary and the non-Federal entity. At a minimum, the cooperative agreement shall—

(A) require the non-Federal entity to operate and maintain the water impoundment structures covered by the agreement in accordance with a plan of operations approved by the Secretary;

(B) require approval by the Secretary of all operation and maintenance activities to be conducted by the non-Federal entity;

(C) require the non-Federal entity to comply with all applicable State and Federal environmental, public health, and safety requirements; and

(D) establish enforcement standards, including termination of the cooperative agreement for noncompliance by the non-Federal entity with the terms and conditions.

(3) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall ensure that the non-Federal entity remains in compliance with the terms and conditions of this section and the cooperative agreement.

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—The non-Federal entity shall be responsible for—

(1) carrying out its operation and maintenance activities with respect to the water impoundment structures covered by the cooperative agreement under subsection (a) in conformance with this section and the cooperative agreement; and

(2) the costs associated with the maintenance and operation of the structures.

(f) PROHIBITION ON USE OF MECHANIZED TRANSPORT AND MOTORIZED EQUIPMENT.—The non-Federal entity may not use mechanized transport or motorized equipment—

(1) to operate or maintain the water impoundment structures covered by the cooperative agreement under subsection (a); or

(2) to otherwise conduct activities in the Emigrant Wilderness pursuant to the cooperative agreement.

(g) EXPANSION OF AGREEMENT TO COVER ADDITIONAL STRUCTURES.—In the case of the six water impoundment structures located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness, but not specified in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture may expand the scope of the cooperative agreement under subsection (a), with the consent of the State of California and the other party to the agreement, to include one or more of these structures, subject to the same terms and conditions as apply to the structures specified in subsection (b).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $20,000 to cover administrative costs incurred by the Secretary to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) in carrying out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

□ 1430

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), for his work on H.R. 434, the Emigrant Wilderness Protection Act. This bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to enter into a cooperative agreement with non-Federal entities to retain, maintain and operate at private expense the 12 small check dams and weirs, located within the Emigrant Wilderness boundary. The work would be down under terms and conditions established by the Secretary and without use of mechanized transport or motorized equipment. The bill authorizes $20,000 to be appropriated to cover administrative costs incurred by the Secretary to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Although not specifically indicated within the legislation, it is widely believed to have been the intent of Congress when it passed the Emigrant Wilderness Act in 1974 to preserve the 18 check dam structures. Report language for the 1974 act explained: ''Within the area recommended for wilderness designation, there are drift fences, five miles, which will be maintained, but several cabins and barns will be removed within 10 years. Two snow cabins will be retained. The weirs and small dams will likewise be retained,'' House Report No. 93–989, page 10, April 11, 1974.

This is a good, well thought-out, common-sense bill, Mr. Speaker; and I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

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

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

H.R. 434 would allow for the nonmotorized maintenance and repair of 12 concrete dams in the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest in California. The bill would allow the Forest Service to enter into cooperative agreements to delegate the maintenance work and expense to private properties. These structures were built between 1931 and 1954 and were in existence when Congress designated the Wilderness area in 1974. Several provide water during the dry seasons for trout habitat.

Although dams generally do not belong in Wilderness and the forest planning process is addressing this issue, several factors make the bill acceptable: first, litigation threatens to drag the planning process out for years. Second, these dams, some of which are eligible for listing on the National Register for Historic Places, predate the establishment of the Wilderness, have a history of nonmotorized maintenance, and are, for the most part, unobtrusive. Finally, the expense is not borne by the taxpayer.

As reported out of committee, this bill represents a reasonable compromise, reducing the number of dams maintained from 18 to 12 and mirroring the bill that passed the House last Congress. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 434, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a cooperative agreement to provide for retention, maintenance, and operation, at private expense, of 12 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FEASIBILITY STUDIES ACT OF 2001

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1937) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in certain feasibility studies of water resource projects in the State of Washington, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1937

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pacific Northwest Feasibility Studies Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior may engage in the following feasibility studies:

(1) The Tulalip Tribes Water Quality Feasibility Study, to identify ways to meet future domestic and commercial water distribution needs of the Tulalip Indian Reservation on the Eastern Shore of Puget Sound, Washington.

(2) The Lower Elwha Klallam Rural Water Supply Feasibility Study, to identify additional rural water supply sources for the Lower Elwha Indian Reservation on the Olympic Peninsula, Washington.

(3) The Makah Community Water Source Project Feasibility Study, to identify ways to meet the current and future domestic and commercial water supply and distribution needs of the Makah Indian Tribe on the Olympic Peninsula, Washington.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF RESULTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall make available to the public, upon request, the results of each feasibility study authorized under subsection (a), and shall promptly publish in the Federal Register a notice of the availability of those results.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1937, authored by the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN) will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies for three Native American tribes in the State of Washington. The purpose of the studies is to investigate the feasibility of providing potable water and wastewater distribution systems to meet the future domestic and commercial needs of the tribes.

This is a noncontroversial bill, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

I rise in strong support as well of H.R. 1937, the Pacific Northwest Feasibility Studies Act. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN), for his hard work in bringing this bill to the House floor today.

H.R. 1937 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to engage in water supply feasibility studies to benefit several Native American communities in the State of Washington. The studies will help the communities to identify the best ways to meet their water supply and distribution needs for domestic, rural, and commercial water users.

The bill also requires the Secretary to make the results of these studies available to the public and to publish a notice of the availability of study results. The report and accompanying environmental and economic analyses will provide the Congress with recommendations on how best to proceed with cost-effective and environmentally sound solutions to the water problems facing these communities.

This legislation enjoys broad support, and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1937.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the sponsor of H.R. 1937.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to speak on behalf of H.R. 1937, the Pacific Northwest Feasibility Studies Act of 2001.

I first want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) on the Republican side, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) on the Democratic side for their support in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

I just want to point out this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct water feasibility studies for three Native American tribes in Washington State. I want to speak briefly about one in particular, which is in my district, the Tulalip Indian Tribe. The Tulalip reservation is located outside of Marysville and covers approximately 35 square miles. The permanent population of the reservation is under 7,000 and continues to grow significantly, but during the summer and holidays the reservation population increases by up to 40 percent.

Like many American Indian reservations, the Tulalip reservation faces groundwater access barriers due to the presence of glacial sediments, a shallow aquifer system, bordering salt water and limited drainage. Likewise, most of the current drinking water on the reservation is supplied from a patchwork of public and private wells. Continued degradation of the water resources on the reservation will limit the development of the reservation and surrounding areas.

The study that this bill authorizes is vital to ensure the long-term safety and accessibility of groundwater on the reservation. So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 1937.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, in closing, to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), for her support in helping to bring these four bills to the floor today. Especially the first one, I failed to thank her on the floor for that, so I will do it now.

I want to thank her and all the Members for their support in bringing these four bills forward.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my colleague for those kind words. It has been a pleasure sharing this afternoon with him and getting these bills to the floor and passed, as well as working with him on the committee these several years.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1937, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 695, H.R. 434, H.R. 1628, and H.R. 1937, the four bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2133) to establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 3, line 8, strike out ''Chair'' and insert *''one of two Co-chairpersons''*.

Page 3, after line 8, insert:

(2) Two representatives of the Department of Justice appointed by the Attorney General, one of whom shall serve as one of two Co-chairpersons of the Commission.

Page 3, line 9, strike out ''(2)'' and insert *''(3)''*.

Page 3, strike out lines 11 to 22.

Page 3, after line 22, insert:

(A)(i) The Members of the Senate from each State described in clause (iii) shall each submit the name of 1 individual from the State to the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(ii) After review of the submissions made under clause (i), the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall recommend to the President 5 individuals, 1 from each of the States described in clause (iii).

(iii) The States described in this clause are the States in which the lawsuits decided by the Brown decision were originally filed (Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia), and the State of the first legal challenge involved (Massachusetts).

(B)(i) The Members of the House of Representatives from each State described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall each submit the name of 1 individual from the State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(ii) After review of the submissions made under clause (i), the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives, shall recommend to the President 5 individuals, 1 from each of the States described in subparagraph (A)(iii).

Page 4, line 3, strike out ''(3)'' and insert *''(4)''*.

Page 4, line 6, strike out ''(4)'' and insert *''(5)''*.

Page 4, line 8, strike out ''(5)'' and insert *''(6)''*.

Page 4, line 10, strike out ''(6)'' and insert *''(7)''*.

Page 5, line 4, strike out ''the Chair'' and insert *''a Co-chairperson''*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2133, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 2133 introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), which would establish a commission to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Brown versus Board of Education decision. This bill passed the House on June 27, 2001, under suspension of the rules by a vote of 414 to 2 and passed the Senate on August 3 with some amendments. These amendments change how the commission would be formed and who would make the recommendations for commission members.

Mr. Speaker, May 17, 2004, will mark the 50th anniversary of this landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision. This legislation would establish a Federal commission to provide for and encourage the commemoration of that anniversary. The Brown decision, as studied in law schools across the United States, is remembered for its definite interpretation of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution. The Court stated that the discriminatory nature of racial segregation violates the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees all citizens equal protection of the laws.

On a human level, the Brown decision has had a dramatic impact on families, communities, and governments by outlawing racial segregation, meaning an end to legal discrimination on any basis. Today, we take it as a given that, as the Court opined at that time, separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

Cheryl Brown Henderson, of the Brown Foundation, had the idea to establish a commission to prepare for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of this decision. Seeing the educational value this commission would bring, my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), followed through with legislation to establish it. The commission would work in conjunction with the Department of Education to plan and coordinate public education activities and initiatives through its 10 regional offices. Activities such as public lectures, writing contests, and public awareness campaigns will be included.

The commission is to be comprised of 22 members, including representatives from the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, the NAACP, the Judicial Branch, the Brown Foundation, and the Brown v. Board National Historic Site. In addition, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from the States in which the lawsuits were originally filed, Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia, and from the State of the first legal challenge, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia would recommend individuals to the Speaker of the House and minority leader and the majority and minority leader in the Senate for the commission.

Ultimately, we hope that this commission will educate Americans about the far-reaching historical impact of this decision and what it has done for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), the sponsor of this bill, to speak on behalf of it.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank those in the House and the other body for their hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor today. I especially want to thank one of my constituents, Cheryl Brown Henderson, for being the catalyst in this effort to educate America on the Brown versus Board of Education Supreme Court decision.

H.R. 2133 will establish a commission to help educate Americans on the history and ramifications of this landmark case in preparation for the 50th anniversary of the Brown decision. On May 17, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a definitive interpretation of the 14th amendment that would unequivocally change the landscape of American public education. This decision effectively ended the long-held ''separate but equal'' doctrine in U.S. education.

The commission will work in conjunction with a number of different Departments, as my colleague just mentioned, the Department of Education, Judicial Branch, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Foundation, and the Brown Foundation. It will also have individuals chosen from the various States where this originated, such as in Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Massachusetts will also serve on the commission. So it will be very far-reaching, but it is a great opportunity to bring all this before the American public.

Establishing a commission will help educate the American public on this decision and will serve as a resounding reminder to all of us of the real struggle and sacrifice required to make equality a reality for all America.

□ 1445

We must not forget these sacrifices that were made in order for equality for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this historic and far-reaching Supreme Court decision by supporting H.R. 2133.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2133, the legislation to establish the Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. Davis) for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor as the ranking member and co-sponsor of this bill.

This commission, in conjunction with the Department of Education and the Department of Justice, is charged with planning and coordinating public educational activities, initiatives, writing contests, and public awareness campaigns regarding this anniversary of Brown v. the Board of Education.

Under the bill, the commission will in cooperation with the Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research, submit recommendations to the Congress to encourage, plan and develop the observances of the anniversary of Brown decision. The 50th anniversary of the Brown decision will take place on May 17, 2004. Brown v. the Board of Education is to be commemorated for what it did to address the disparities in the American educational system 47 years ago and to help remind us that there is much yet to be done to address the disparities that we struggle with even today.

Education has always been the way up and the way out for America's youth. Equal educational opportunity is America's best hope for racial, social, and economic justice. It was because of this fact that in 1951 Oliver Brown and the parents of 12 other black children filed a lawsuit against the Topeka Board of Education protesting the City's segregation of black and white students. This is why also today parents all across America, particularly parents of children of color, are demanding that elected officials improve the quality and equality of America's schools.

In 1997, we know that 93 percent of whites age 25 to 29 had attained a high school diploma or equivalency degree. In that same year, only 87 percent of African-Americans had attained their high school diploma and just 63 percent of Hispanics. Among those who achieved a high school diploma, 37 percent of whites had completed a bachelor's degree at a college or university compared with only 16 percent of African-Americans and 18 percent of Hispanics. Clearly the statistics revealed to us that we have not yet achieved the goals of Brown v. Board of Education.

Given the increasing importance of skills in our labor market, these gaps in educational attainment translate into significant differences by race and ethnicity in eventual labor market outcomes, such as wages and employment.

It is important to remember that the historic Brown v. Board of Education decision, which was announced in May of 1954 by Chief Justice Earl Warren, represented a significant change in our policy in our public schools that has meant much progress for those who were for many years segregated into substandard and unequal classrooms.

Justice Warren, in that opinion, stated that public education was a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. I trust that this commission will remember those words when planning for the observances of the 50th anniversary of the Brown decision. I hope those words will remind all of us that we have yet to achieve the goals that were set forth in that historic opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today in support of H.R. 2133 which would establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary on May 17, 2004 of the Supreme Court's unanimous and landmark 1954 decision in Brown v. the Board of Education.

While the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution outlawed slavery, guaranteed rights of citizenship to naturalized citizens and due process, equal protection and voting rights, nearly a century would pass before the last vestiges of ''legalized'' discrimination and inequality would be effectively revoked. The right of equal protection under the law for African-Americans was dealt a heavy blow with the Supreme Court's 1875 decision to uphold a lower court in Plessy v. Ferguson. The Plessy decision created the infamous ''separate but equal'' doctrine that made segregation ''constitutional'' for almost 80 years.

It was not until the 1950's, when the NAACP defense team led by the Honorable Thurgood Marshall as general counsel, launched a national campaign to challenge segregation at the elementary school level that effective and lasting change was achieved. In five individually unique cases filed in four states and the District of Columbia, the NAACP defense team not only claimed that segregated schools told Black children they were inferior to White children, but that the ''separate by equal'' ruling in Plessy violated equal protection. Although all five lost in the lower courts, the U.S. Supreme Court accepted each case in turn, hearing them collectively in what became Brown v. Board of Education.

The Brown decision brought a decisive end to segregation and discrimination in our public school systems, and gradually our national, cultural and social consciousness as well.

The first, however, did not end there. We may have overcome segregation and racism, but now the fight is economic, one in which some of our schools are inferior to others because of inadequate funding, overcrowded classrooms, dilapidated school buildings and a nationwide lack of teachers. We only have to look at the high levels of crime, drug use, juvenile delinquency, teen pregnancy and unemployment to know the value of a good education. If Brown taught us anything, it is that without the proper educational tools, young people lose hope for the future.

No one challenges the concept of investing in human capital, but it is a well-known fact that we spend ten times as much to incarcerate then we do to educate. If we can find the resources to fund a tax cut and for a U.S. prison system with nearly 2 million inmates, we can give our public schools the repairs and facilities they desperately need, we can reduce class sizes and provide adequate pay to attract the best and brightest into the teaching profession.

I urge my colleagues here in the House to join me in remembering the lessons of Brown v. Board of Education when we consider our national priorities, by committing ourselves to addressing the unfulfilled promises of equality and opportunity contained in the Brown decision.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2133.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF ARMY RESERVE CENTER IN KEWAUNEE, WISCONSIN TO CITY OF KEWAUNEE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 788) to provide for the conveyance of the excess Army Reserve Center in Kewaunee, Wisconsin, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 788

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

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY RESERVE CENTER, KEWAUNEE, WISCONSIN.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Administrator of General Services shall convey, without consideration, to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of Federal real property, including improvements thereon, that is located at 401 5th Street in Kewaunee, Wisconsin, and contains an excess Army Reserve Center. After such conveyance, the property may be used and occupied only by the City, or by another local or State government entity approved by the City.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Administrator. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the City.

(c) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—During the 20-year period beginning on the date the Administrator makes the conveyance under subsection (a), if the Administrator determines that the conveyed property is not being used and occupied in accordance with such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property, including any improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States. Upon reversion, the United States shall immediately proceed to a public sale of the property.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—(1) The property shall not be used for commercial purposes.

(2) The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Any net proceeds received by the United States as payment under subsection (c) shall be deposited into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 788 would require the General Services Administration to convey to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin at no cost a parcel of property containing an Army Reserve Center located in northwest Kewaunee. The property consists of two buildings with approximately 17,000 square feet of space constructed on 4.4 acres of land.

The property is excess to the needs of the Army and surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. It has been vacant since 1996.

Currently, the City of Kewaunee's municipal services are located at different sites around the city. Kewaunee city hall, police department, ambulance service and community center/senior center have outgrown their present facilities. They require room to expand. The City of Kewaunee intends to consolidate these services at the vacant Army Reserve center.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, as has been pointed out, directs the administrator of the General Services Administration to convey an excess Army Reserve Center to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin. It consists of about four-and-a-half acres of lands. It is a piece of property that the City plans to use only for governmental purposes. It is going to be a very important building to this small community of less than 3,000 people by providing a place for a city hall, a city council meeting place. It may also house police, emergency rescue personnel, and other municipal functions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for his efforts in putting this bill together as it pertains to his district. I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for accommodating concerns raised about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill on the floor is a better bill than we started out with and protects the interests of the Federal Government by specifying that the property must be used exclusively for a government purpose for not less than 20 years or title would revert to the United States Government.

At the same time the legislation will provide the City of Kewaunee with a suitable municipal building which it otherwise would be unable to afford. It is important to note that not only does this legislation bypass normal committee procedures, it is considered ''special legislation'' because it is not being considered under the normal Federal property disposal procedures. Under normal Federal property disposal procedures, a transfer of this kind would not be currently permitted.

We are pleased to join today in accommodating the interest which has been shared with our committee by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) to enable the City of Kewaunee to have this building which is no longer needed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that even though this building does not fit within any of the traditional exceptions for transfer, that the circumstances of this case will speak for themselves and that Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will join with us in supporting the passage of this legislation.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), the bill sponsor, a strong fighter for the citizens of Kewaunee, Wisconsin.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee staff and the staff of the gentleman from Virginia and, in particular, the minority staff. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) alluded to, the extra help and assistance and cooperation they gave us, we appreciate very much.

Mr. Speaker, Kewaunee is a small city of about 3,000 people located on the shores of Lake Michigan. It is filled with good people with big dreams. Kewaunee also faces, like a number of small cities, a number of financial challenges. For several years, Kewaunee has been without the financial resources to sufficiently house basic municipal services in its city hall and police station and fire station.

Mr. Speaker, when the U.S. Army abandoned its reserve center in 1996, it created the opportunity for meeting those challenges. Since 1996, the Kewaunee Reserve Center has worked through the GSA disposal process. It was declared excess in 1998; and since then, there has been no expression of interest by any Federal agency. Currently, only the City of Kewaunee has any interest in this property.

Right now the setup for municipal services in the City of Kewaunee is, to put it kindly, less than ideal. The city hall is in the old bank building with no parking or office space. The council shares office space with the business office. The police department is in the water treatment plant. The senior citizens center is on the second floor of the fire station, and the ambulance service is in the public works garage. Obviously, this is not ideal.

Mr. Speaker, people in America, especially from small towns, want government to work for them. They are looking for common sense and partnerships. This is not a big deal to the Federal Government. This building is vacant, and it will need lots of work to bring it up to suitable standards. However, it is a big deal to the City of Kewaunee. It opens new doors to the future, and allows them to reach out and capture some of those good opportunities and big dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority staff for all of their assistance in this special situation.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 788, 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.

STAN PARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1766) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4270 John Marr Drive in Annandale, Virginia, as the ''Stan Parris Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1766

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

SECTION 1. STAN PARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4270 John Marr Drive in Annandale, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Stan Parris Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Stan Parris Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Viginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1766.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1766 sponsored by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) would rename the Post Office at 4270 John Marr Drive in Annandale, Viginia, to honor Stan Parris, a distinguished and dedicated Republican representative from Northern Virginia.

Stan's career in public service began as a member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors representing the Mason district. He later served the people of Virginia as Secretary of the Commonwealth and Director of the Commonwealth of Virginia's Washington Liaison Office.

Stan went on to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia from 1973 to 1975, and more recently from 1981 to 1991. While in Congress he was a member of the Committee on Banking, the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Stan was a vocal critic of D.C. Government policies in the 1980s and recognized the early signs of the City's financial and organizational mismanagement, which eventually escalated to crisis level by the mid-1990s. Additionally, he was among the first congressional Members calling for the closure of Lorton Prison, a process that finally began as part of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1977. Stan was ahead of his time.

While serving in Congress, Stan successfully pursued measures to alleviate traffic congestion in Northern Virginia. A strong advocate for the residents of Virginia's Eighth Congressional District, he worked tirelessly on behalf of Federal employees and military retirees to help them obtain better salaries and benefits.

□ 1500

After leaving Congress, Stan was appointed by the President to serve as the administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and since 1996 he has worked with the law firm of Dickstein, Shapiro, Moore and Oshinsky, LLP. He now resides in Hudgins, Virginia.

I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation honoring Stan Parris.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague (Chairman DAVIS) in supporting H.R. 1766, legislation sponsored by our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

This legislation honors a distinguished former member of this House, Stan Parris, by naming the post office in Annandale, Virginia, after him.

Mr. Parris is a gentleman that I did not have the pleasure of knowing. He left the Congress in 1991, long before I arrived; but I understand from reading his background that he was an outstanding Member of this body, a distinguished American; and certainly I commend my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for seeking to honor such a distinguished man and former Member of this Congress.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the bill's sponsor, the inspiration for this legislation and a gentleman who served with Mr. Parris in the House for many years.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), too, for his efforts to bring this up and the other side of the aisle for their help and the gentleman from Virginia's (Mr. TOM DAVIS) help on passing the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues on the Committee on Government Reform in bringing this legislation to the floor to designate a U.S. postal building in Annandale, Virginia, to honor Congressman Stan Parris, who served Virginia's 8th Congressional District for six terms.

It is the privilege as the Representative of the 10th Congressional District to be a sponsor of this bill.

Born in Champaign, Illinois, September 4, 1929, Stan Parris was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1972. After serving one term and losing in that very tough 1974, what they called the ''Watergate Year,'' he returned to capture a seat in 1980.

Congressman Parris went on to win five consecutive elections, serving from 1981 to 1991.

As an aside, during that period of time we would sit back over here many times and chat and talk when issues would come up; and I would say, Stan, and we would say just back and forth, and I can almost see Stan kind of standing back there and thinking of all the conversations that we would have about issues coming up before the Congress.

Stan had a very distinguished career in serving this country, both as an elected official and as a veteran. Assisting the people he represented was the cornerstone of his service in Congress.

Congressman Parris consistently helped Federal employees and military retirees, both largely represented in Virginia's 8th district. He involved himself early and often in transportation issues, an area of considerable importance to the citizens of northern Virginia.

Congressman Parris was a vigilant defender of the taxpayer and spoke out against instances of fraud and abuse, and according to the Almanac of American Politics 1990, it said Parris was one of the earlier voices in Congress to warn of an impending crisis in the savings and loan industry, speaking out in the fall of 1985. If only the Congress had listened to Stan Parris.

He graduated from George Washington University Law School in 1958, and if my memory serves me he worked on a copy machine down in the basement of this capitol when he was working his way through law school. Winning an award for outstanding law student of the year, Congressman Parris went on to serve in the U.S. Air Force as a jet pilot during the Korean war.

He distinguished himself in combat in Korea, winning the Distinguished Flying Cross, the air medal with cluster, the Purple Heart and the U.S. and Korean Presidential Citation.

It was once told to me, if you want to understand Stan Parris, read the book ''Right Stuff'' because Parris was being considered to be an astronaut, was a jet fighter and in many respects a war hero; and if you listen to what actually happened to him, which I will not go into, I think the body would be very impressed.

After starting out in the private sector, Congressman Parris won his first elected office in 1963 as the only Republican member of the Fairfax Board of Supervisors. He then, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) said, was Secretary of State of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

In 1969, Congressman Parris went on to serve as a delegate in the Virginia General Assembly for 4 years, serving as chairman for the joint House-Senate Republican caucus.

Congressman Parris went on to win the seat for northern Virginia's 8th Congressional District in 1972 in a very close election.

In 1980 Congressman Parris won a spirited and close election, regaining his seat by under 1,100 votes.

I see the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) across the aisle, who is ready to follow and introduce a bill to name, appropriately so, a post office down in Mount Vernon for Herb Harris.

To have the Herb Harris Post Office along with Stan Parris is very fitting because they both ably were fighters for what they believed in. They were advocates for their cause and I think really served this region very, very well.

After winning five consecutive terms, Stan Parris lost his bid for reelection in 1992, but his work and public service continued. President Bush asked him to be president of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, where he used to come before my appropriation committee, and may have been the best head of the Saint Lawrence Seaway that we have had in the history of the country.

He was responsible for overseeing the Federal agency charged with operating, managing and promoting maritime activity for the entire Great Lakes region of the Nation.

Stan Parris has dedicated most of his life to serving his country in both a public and military capacity. His commitment and his devotion to public service is deserving of recognition and it is appropriate that the postal building of 4270 John Marr Drive in Annandale, Virginia, be renamed in his honor.

I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation to honor this former Member for his dedicated service and just want to wish Stan the very, very best and his wife, Marty, and his entire family and on behalf of the people of the Commonwealth and the entire Congress, thank Stan and thank his family, because you know how part of the whole process the family can be, for his service to the country as a war hero and as a Member of this Congress.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), who succeeded Mr. Parris here in the House.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), in whose district the Stan Parris Post Office will be located.

This is a very nice post office, and it is appropriate that it be named after Stan Parris; and I want to commend my other good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). It was really his idea that we name both these offices in tandem after Stan Parris and Herb Harris in true bipartisan tradition.

This one that we are speaking specifically about is that for Stan Parris, and the reason why Stan certainly deserves a post office being named after him is that he devoted his life to public service.

He was a fighter pilot during the Korean war. I am sure that that has been mentioned. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with cluster, the Air Medal with clusters, Purple Heart and the U.S. and Korean Presidential Citations. So he really was a war hero.

After the war, he continued his commitment to public service. He was on the Fairfax Board of County Supervisors. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) chaired that board and he knows what difficult, thankless work that can be.

He was supervisor in a particularly important transitional time in local government in Fairfax County, and he also served as a delegate in the General Assembly in Richmond for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The reason why this Congress should recognize him is his service for 12 years in the United States House of Representatives. He was on the Committee on District of Columbia; Committee on Government Operations; the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committees. He was chair of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs and Health, Government Operations and Metropolitan Affairs where he promoted fiscal responsibility.

I am very pleased that the three of us can recognize him, the gentleman from

Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and I, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER); and we speak for the entire Congress.

You have done a great job, Stan, and this is a very appropriate, fitting tribute to you to name this post office after you.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1766.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HERB E. HARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1761) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8588 Richmond Highway in Alexandria, Virginia, as the ''Herb E. Harris Post Office Building'', as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1761

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

SECTION 1. HERB HARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8588 Richmond Highway in Alexandria, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Herb Harris Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Herb Harris Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to stand before you today to speak on behalf of H.R. 1761, designing the United States Post Office located at 8588 Richmond Highway in Alexandria, Virginia, as the Herb Harris Post Office Building.

Herb Harris, again, came from the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors where he cut his teeth politically. He had a very distinguished career there. He was elected in 1975 to the 94th Congress and two succeeding Congresses representing what was then Virginia's Eighth Congressional District. He was the first freshman Congressman in 25 years to serve as chairman of the House District of Columbia Subcommittee on the Environment Bicentennial Celebration and International Community as well.

Prior to being elected to Congress, Herb served as vice chairman of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Transit Authority from 1970 to 1974 as a member of the County Board of Supervisors from Fairfax at that point representing the Mount Vernon District. He had been vice chairman of the County Board of Supervisors in Fairfax County as well, was a very distinguished leader there both in Fairfax and regionally. He was the instrumental figure in securing the needed funding for construction of Metro. We think of Stark-Harris funds and the legislation that came out of that landmark legislation. The Metro system as it exists today would not be there but for Herb Harris. He was a leader in getting money for that area and allocating it, bringing the region together to address the problems with building this mighty system.

After leaving Congress in January 1981, Herb resumed the practice of law with the firm of Harris Ellsworth & Levin in Washington, D.C. He still resides in Mount Vernon, Virginia, today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to thank Herb for his service to Fairfax County, the Washington metropolitan region, and to this country. I would urge adoption of this bill.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank again my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). This is a neat opportunity to recognize two very distinguished individuals.

This bill would name a post office after my good friend, Congressman Herb Harris. It will be at 8588 Richmond Highway, which is Route 1. It is a brand new post office in an area that desperately needs a post office and needs economic redevelopment, and this will provide it to that area. It is more than appropriate that we honor Herb Harris, who represented the Mount Vernon District on the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, became vice chair, as the gentleman from Virginia has said, and he still lives in Mount Vernon. He is still very much involved in what goes on in that community.

□ 1515

He did more things for that community and for Fairfax County, and, in many ways, for the Nation, than we will ever know.

He began his public service in 1968. He was instrumental in getting funding for a new hospital and expanding the libraries in the Mount Vernon area and in Fairfax County. He spent a lot of time on thankless tasks, like limiting utility costs and tax rates.

He was first elected in 1975 to the Congress after serving as vice chair of the Metropolitan Washington Transit Authority, and he used that experience on the Metro board to continually push for expansion of the Metro system. He got the legislation through that approved $1.9 billion in final construction funds for the full 101-mile Metro design.

Metro is critical to the entire Metropolitan Washington area. In the early days, it was a very controversial, very political issue, to bring Metro out to the suburbs and to pay the costs. You had to have a vision, and Herb had that vision.

He also promoted the rights of Federal employees. He was fiscally responsible, and he emphasized the need for future planning in terms of transportation needs. In so many areas, we find today that he was even more correct than we understood at the time in terms of meeting those transportation needs.

It was the first time in 25 years that a freshman Member of Congress was selected to serve as chairman of a subcommittee when Herb was designated as the chair of the Subcommittee on the Environment, Bicentennial Celebration and International Community in Washington.

It is with great gratitude that I thank Herb on behalf of the Members of this body, all the Members of this body, and really of the country, for his tireless efforts to improve the lives of Virginia's and America's residents. He was a forward-looking individual that was a lot of fun to work with, and he was tireless in his devotion to public service. That is why it is most appropriate that we designate the Post Office at 8588 Richmond Highway as the Herb E. Harris Post Office Building.

We have Congressman Harris with us. Herb, thank you for all you did. You are so deserving of this honor.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a question for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr.

MORAN): Does this post office stay in the Eighth Congressional District under the new boundaries that the Virginia General Assembly has promulgated?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) would know better than I, controlling the redistricting; but, you betcha. Absolutely.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for this effort in helping with this legislation, and I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of comments. Herb Harris, as I said in a previous debate, was a fighter, was an advocate. I first met Herb when I was a young lawyer here in town. He was with the American Farm Bureau. Then he went on to do all the amazing things that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) said. So it is very fitting.

Mr. Speaker, it would really be fitting for the Post Office to have these dedications of Mr. Parris' Post Office and Mr. Harris' Post Office on the same day. I think it would be a great sign, if you will, when Stan Parris comes to Herb Harris' dedication and Herb Harris comes to Stan Parris' dedication.

With that, I say congratulations, and I wish Herb the very, very best.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Congressman Harris has informed me that the actual name of his law firm is Harris Ellsworth & Levin.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also note that Mr. Harris is a former president, as I understand it, of the Bren Mar Park Civic Association, which was in the Mason District which I once represented.

Again, let me say to Herb Harris, thank you for Metro, thank you for the Mount Vernon Hospital, thank you for your years of service as well. We look forward to the dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1761, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1766, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1761, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

STAN PARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 1766.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1766, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 0, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—362

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney

Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—68

Ackerman
Barcia
Barr
Barton
Bentsen
Berman
Blagojevich
Boehner
Brady (PA)
Camp
Carson (IN)
Chambliss
Conyers
Cooksey
Crenshaw
Crowley
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutsch
Doolittle
Emerson
Engel
Evans
Ferguson
Foley
Fossella
Ganske
Grucci
Gutierrez
Istook
Kilpatrick
Knollenberg
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lipinski
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Neal
Owens
Payne
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Roukema
Royce
Sanders
Schaffer
Serrano
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Towns
Velazquez
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)

□ 1824

Mr. SHADEGG changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

HERB E. HARRIS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1761, 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 Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1761, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 0, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—65

Ackerman
Barcia
Barr
Barton
Berman
Blagojevich
Boehner
Brady (PA)
Camp
Carson (IN)
Chambliss
Conyers
Cooksey
Crenshaw
Crowley
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
Deutsch
Doolittle
Emerson
Engel
Ferguson
Foley
Fossella
Ganske
Grucci
Gutierrez
Kilpatrick
Knollenberg
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Lipinski
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Neal
Owens
Payne
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Roukema
Royce
Sanders
Schaffer
Serrano
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Towns
Velazquez
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)

□ 1836

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8588 Richmond Highway in Alexandria, Virginia, as the 'Herb Harris Post Office Building'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the chamber today during rollcall vote No. 336 and 337. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 336 and ''yea'' on rollcall vote No. 337.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, due to my Mother's sudden heart attack, I will be unable to participate in today's recorded votes. However, if I were present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 336 and rollcall 337.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to personal business in my District, I was unable to record my vote on H.R. 1766, (rollcall No. 336) and H.R. 1761, (rollcall No. 337). Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained because of a late flight and could not

vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 336 and ''yea'' on rollcall No. 337.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1983

Mr. SCHROCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1983.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2269

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 2269.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND DR. JAMES FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a former Minnesotan who devoted his life to ministering to others and who made a huge difference in the lives of the people in this very House for over 2 decades. For 21 years, the House of Representatives was very well served by our dedicated and beloved chaplain, the Reverend Dr. James Ford. Seven days a week, year after year, Jim Ford was here for us and our families in times of deepest need. Jim was always here to encourage, console, humor, and inspire us. That is why all of us were terribly shocked and saddened to hear of his death on August 27. Our thoughts and prayers are with his family: his wife, Marcy; son, Peter; daughters, Julie, Marie, Molly and Sarah; sister, Janet; 9 grandchildren; and countless friends all over the world.

So many memories come flooding back at a time like this. Jim Ford leaves a legacy of love and service for his family, friends, and Nation which will be remembered always. His eloquent well-chosen words and ever-present wit helped keep our focus on what was truly important: working together to serve people.

□ 1845

Also Jim Ford taught us to take our job seriously, but not ourselves. Which Norwegian or Swede among us will ever forget Jim's endless litany of Ole and Sven stories.

Madam Speaker, we all remember the countless tributes that were directed at Jim Ford as he marked his well-deserved retirement 2 years ago. Jim's many distinguished years of service to the United States Military Academy, 19 to be exact, and his earlier years at Ivanhoe Lutheran Church at Ivanhoe, Minnesota, are well known and well documented.

What is not so well known are Jim Ford's very early years in Minnesota and his legendary escapades as a young ski jumper at Theodore Wirth Park in Minneapolis. Let the record reflect that our former beloved Chaplain, Dr. Jim Ford, still holds the record jump at the famous Theodore Wirth Ski jump, backward.

That is right, when he was a young student at Edison High School in northeast Minneapolis, Jim Ford defied the laws of gravity and common sense and survived a backward jump on this notoriously steep ski slope and lived to tell about it.

We now know backward ski jumping was just the beginning of Jim Ford's high-risk hobbies. From his beloved Harley to his ultralight aircraft, Jim lived life with a special zeal. Whether it was his frequent racquetball games in the House gym or a cross-country ride on his Harley, Jim Ford went for all the gusto.

Madam Speaker, they still talk proudly about their prominent alumnus, Jim Ford, at Edison High School in northeast Minneapolis and Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota, where Jim starred in the classroom and also on the athletic field.

''You can take Jim Ford from Minnesota, but you cannot take Minnesota from Jim Ford,'' was how his Gustavus classmate, the Reverend Bill Albertson, put it. Some of us remember my good friend and former minister, Bill Albertson, served as our guest chaplain here several years ago. Jim and Bill had a great time reminiscing that day. I will never forget our time together.

On behalf of all Minnesotans, Madam Speaker, we salute the memory of the Reverend Dr. Jim Ford and his many accomplishments. He was always there for us in good times, in hard times, in times of joy, in times of sorrow. We thank the Lord for his prayers, his counsel, great wit, compassion, and service.

We also thank God for the way Reverend Ford cared so deeply about our families, our friends, our constituents, our House of Representatives, and our beloved country. Madam Speaker, we will always be grateful for Reverend Jim Ford's work and for the way he brought Democrats, Republicans, and Independents together for the good of our great Nation.

Jim Ford, I know you are in heaven right now, probably telling Ole and Sven jokes. May God bless you always, just as your work here in the House of Representatives blessed all of us. May your great legacy of service continue to inspire all of us who are lucky enough to be your friends.

Chaplain Jim Ford might be gone, but his spirit will live forever.

A SUSPENSION VOTE TOMORROW ON THE 245(i) AMNESTY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on H.R. 1885, which extends the 245 amnesty program. I am surprised that this vote is actually coming up under suspension. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to this legislation and to this vote.

What we are voting on tomorrow extends the date for illegal aliens to qualify for a 245(i) amnesty to August 15, 2001, and it extends the date for illegal aliens to apply for that 245(i) amnesty program for a full year, until April 30, 2002.

For those who have a little trouble understanding what that all means, let me explain it this way, that what we have are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of illegal aliens who are in this country; and we are now step by step trying to find ways in which we can make them legal, as the President has suggested. Perhaps the word is ''regularize,'' or whatever word one wants to use.

But what we are really talking about when we offer a step-by-step process of whittling away this number of illegal immigrants, what we are talking about is an amnesty program, a step-by-step amnesty program, rather than just one large amnesty.

The American people understand what amnesty is all about, and they will be watching and they will be looking at the record when they find out what Congress has been moving. Rather than being forthright in dealing with the amnesty issue, instead, it has tried to exercise its authority in a way that was a little less discernible to the public by granting amnesty to various groups within society.

In this case, we would be granting amnesty in an interesting way, that is, anyone who is in this country illegally who applies, and now we are giving them until April 2002 to apply, can try to regularize their status in the United States. We have several categories of people who are here illegally to be able to do that.

Guess what, that is an amnesty program. We are giving amnesty to several

hundred thousand people who are in this country illegally.

Yes, there are some heart-tearing cases here. Yes, some people who are in this country end up marrying American citizens, and the American citizens find that their loved one is going to have to go back to their home country in order to be here legally, because they have married an illegal alien. I am sorry, if someone is here illegally and they are going to have to go back, then they should go back to their home country to regularize their status.

Tomorrow, on H.R. 1885, we are, for hundreds of thousands of people, going to be basically granting them the right to amnesty without going to their home country to legalize their status. This does nothing but encourage the millions, and we are talking about tens of millions, of people who are standing in line throughout the world waiting to come into this country legally so they can become citizens; but we have done nothing but encourage them to come here illegally, to reward the law-breakers, and to punish those people who are following the law.

This is ridiculous. Our colleagues should consider this and vote against the suspension tomorrow on the bill, H.R. 1885.

By the way, let me note that there has been a recent poll by Mr. Zogby, who is one of America's most respected pollsters, which has found out some interesting things about America's attitude toward amnesty.

Most Americans think amnesty is a terrible idea. In fact, 55 percent of all Democrats think it is a bad idea; 56 percent of Republicans; 60 percent of union households; 45 percent of people who call themselves liberals; 59 percent of people who call themselves moderates; 61 percent of people who call themselves conservatives. And here is the real hook, here is the real bell-ringer: 51 percent of all Hispanics in the United States believe that amnesty for illegal immigrants is a bad idea.

We have been lied to over and over again, and so much so that the Republican party has not had the courage to stand up and oppose illegal immigration, as we should have.

The Democratic Party has made its deal with the illegal immigrants at the expense of the standard of living of our poorest citizens and at the expense of the wages that have been kept just level because we have had a massive flow of illegal immigrants into this country. The Democratic Party has made its deal for political power's sake.

The Republicans, on the other hand, will not touch the illegal immigration issue because they are afraid to be called racist. They have been told over and over again that Mexican-Americans, Hispanic Americans, are in favor of illegal immigrants, for some reason. That is absolutely not true. We have finally got a pollster who has done a legitimate poll to show that Hispanic Americans, just like all other Americans, oppose illegal immigration. That is understandable.

Tomorrow we will have our chance to vote against an amnesty program for illegal immigrants by voting against H.R. 1885, which will be coming on the floor.

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2001 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through September 5, 2001.

The term ''current level'' refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the ''section 302(a)'' allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. ''Discretionary action'' refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the ''section 302(b)'' suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accompanying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section 251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the establish limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only. The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned by the budget resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2002	Fiscal years 2002–2006
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,627,934	n.a.
Outlays	1,590,617	n.a.
Revenues	1,638,202	8,878,506
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	977,964	n.a.
Outlays	1,198,811	n.a.
Revenues	1,672,152	8,897,349
Current Level over (+)/under (−) Appropriate Level:		
Budgete Authority	−649,970	n.a.
Outlays	−391,806	n.a.
Revenues	33,950	18,843

n.a.=Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of $649,970,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of $391,806,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of $33,950,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of $18,843,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	7,350	7,350	7,350	7,350
Current Level	0	2	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Difference	−7,350	−7,348	−7,350	−7,350
Armed Services:				
Allocation	146	146	398	398
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−146	−146	−398	−398
Banking and Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	8	9	46	47
Difference	8	9	46	47
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	5	5	32	32
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−5	−5	−32	−32
Commerce:				
Allocation	2,687	2,687	−6,537	−6,537
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−2,687	−2,687	6,537	6,537
International Relations:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	−1,995	−1,995
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	1,995	1,995
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Resources:				
Allocation	0	−3	365	88
Current Level	0	−3	0	−3
Difference	0	0	−365	−91
Judiciary:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	264	264	3,205	3,205
Current Level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−264	−264	−3,205	−3,205
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	1,360	900	15,409	15,069
Current Level	6,425	6,425	36,708	36,708
Difference	5,065	5,525	21,299	21,639

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002: COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(B) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	Revised 302(b) suballocations as of July 26, 2001 (H. Rept. 107–165)		Current level reflecting action completed as of September 5, 2001		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development	15,668	16,044	13	4,257	−15,655	−11,787
Commerce, Justice, State	38,541	38,905	41	12,755	−38,500	−26,150
National Defense	300,209	293,697	0	96,349	−300,209	−197,348
District of Columbia	382	401	0	48	−382	−353
Energy & Water Development	23,705	24,218	1	8,798	−23,704	−15,420
Foreign Operations	15,168	15,087	0	9,569	−15,168	−5,518
Interior	18,941	17,800	36	6,145	−18,905	−11,655
Labor, HHS & Education	119,725	106,224	18,824	69,596	−100,901	−36,628
Legislative Branch	2,892	2,918	0	432	−2,892	−2,486
Military Construction	10,152	9,447	0	6,512	−10,152	−2,935
Transportation [1]	14,893	53,817	20	32,669	−14,873	−21,148
Treasury-Postal Service	17,021	16,292	340	3,727	−16,681	−12,565
VA-HUD-Independence Agencies	85,434	88,069	3,509	49,803	−81,925	−38,266
Unassigned	15	0	0	0	−15	0
Grand total	662,746	682,919	22,784	300.660	−639,962	−382,259

[1] Does not include mass transit BA.

STATEMENT OF FY2003 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 201 OF H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority
Appropriate Level	23,159
Current Level:	
Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee:	
Patent and Trademark Office	0
Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Antitrust Division	0
U.S. Trustee System	0
Federal Trade Commission	0
Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee:	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Health Resources	0
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	0
Child Care Development Block Grant	0
Elementary and Secondary Education (reading excellence)	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (head start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education.	
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee:	0
Payment to Postal Service	0
Federal Building Fund.	
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee:	
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0
Current Level Over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level	−23,159

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SECTION 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

		Statutory cap [1]	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (−) statutory cap
General Purpose	BA	546,945	22,784	−524,161
	OT	537,383	274,511	−262,872
Defense [2]	BA	n.a.	3	n.a.
	OT	n.a.	107,951	n.a.
Nondefense [2]	BA	n.a.	22,781	n.a.
	OT	n.a.	166,560	n.a.
Highway Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	OT	28,489	20,432	−8,057
Mass Transit Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	OT	5,275	5,093	−182
Conservation Category	BA	1,760	0	−1,760
	OT	1,232	624	−608

n.a.=Not applicable.
[1] Established by OMB Sequestration Update Report for Fiscal Year 2002.
[2] Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS RECOMMENDED BY H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

		Proposed statutory cap [1]	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (−) proposed statutory cap
General Purpose	BA	660,986	22,784	−638,202
	OT	647,923	274,511	−373,412

COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS RECOMMENDED BY H. CON. RES. 83, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

		Proposed statutory cap [1]	Current level	Current level over (+)/under (−) proposed statutory cap
Defense [1]	BA	n.a.	3	n.a.
	OT	n.a.	107,951	n.a.
Nondefense [1]	BA	n.a.	22,781	n.a.
	OT	n.a.	166,560	n.a.
Highway Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	OT	28,489	20,432	−8,057
Mass Transit Category	BA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	OT	5,275	5,093	−182
Conservation Category	BA	1,760	0	−1,760
	OT	1,232	624	−608

n.a.=Not applicable.
[1] Defense and nondefense categories are advisory rather than statutory.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2002 budget and is current through September 5, 2001. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H.

Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements. These revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last letter dated July 12, 2001, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 107–20), which changed budget authority and outlays for 2002. The effects of this new law are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

FISCAL YEAR 2002 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues	0	0	1,703,488
Permanents and other spending legislation	984,540	934,501	0
Appropriation legislation	0	280,919	0
Offsetting receipts	−321,790	−321,790	0
Total, previously enacted	662,750	893,630	1,703,488
Enacted this session:			
An act to provide reimbursement authority to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from wildland fire management funds (P.L. 107–13)	0	−3	0
Fallen Hero Survivor Benefit Fairness Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–15)	0	0	−7
Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–16)	6,425	6,425	−31,337
An act to clarify the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with respect to the use of fees (P.L. 107–18)	8	9	8
An act to authorize funding for the National 4–H Program Centennial Initiative (P.L. 107–19)	0	2	0
Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (P.L. 107–20)	65	4,576	0
Total, enacted this session	6,498	11,009	−31,336
Entitlements and Mandatories: Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	308,716	294,172	0
Total Current Level	977,964	1,198,811	1,672,152
Total Budget Resolution	1,627,934	1,590,617	1,638,202
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	33,950
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	−649,970	−391,806	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2002–2006:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,897,349
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,878,506
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	18,843

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: P.L.=Public Law.
Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements, disability reviews, an Earned Income Tax Credit compliance initiative, and adoption assistance. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the budget authority allocation in the budget resolution by $1,446 million, and the outlay allocation by $143 million for these purposes. Those amounts are not included in the current level because the funding has not yet been enacted.

UNIQUE LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, before I begin my Special Order this evening that will address unique legislative issues, I would like to join my colleague who spoke just a few moments ago to acknowledge the great loss of Chaplain Jim Ford, a very special friend to us all.

I am particularly privileged because Chaplain Ford visited my home district in Houston, the 18th Congressional District, and spoke at the pulpit of the church pastored by Reverend Willy Jones. That church is still riveted by the friendship shown by Chaplain Ford, the good humor, and the ability to interact with different faiths.

We know that he is among the angels, and we offer to him and his family our deepest sympathy and our deepest love.

Madam Speaker I wanted to address tonight several issues. First of all, let me do one that is particularly joyous for me in this time of technology and web pages and communications by e-mail.

Let me congratulate First Lady Laura Bush for an exciting weekend, which I am sorry that I missed; but I hope it will be captured around the Nation. That is the National Book Festival; 25,000 persons enjoyed literary art, enjoyed the reading of famous authors actually reading from books. I hope this will take off around the Nation so that this Nation never lacks its appreciation for the written word, for wonderful books written by our national authors. Let us do this around our Nation. I thank Laura Bush, the first lady, for an outstanding job.

Now, I hope that this viewpoint is one that will be based upon the concern for saving lives. In February of this year, 2001, I came to the floor of the House and acknowledged that I believe that the policy toward the Middle East by this administration is wrongheaded and misdirected. I said that because many times engagement in diplomacy is painful. Many times it results in failure. But it is often utilized as the only vehicle and only tool to save lives.

Much laughter and criticism was given to President Clinton in the last days of his administration as he engaged in shuttle diplomacy between Camp David and Washington, D.C. and the country of Israel. I did not find it humorous because it was an attempt to save lives.

Since we have disengaged with the Mideast, all that has resulted is the loss of lives, bloodshed for women, children, and men, both in the Palestinian people and in the Israeli people.

Can anyone believe that our disengagement has been victorious? Does anyone believe in reality that one can stand off to the corner and point fingers and tell ''those guys'' to get to the table of empowerment and peace? No. It is well known that the United States carries a heavy stick with respect to these particular countries, and it also is well known that the United States' good will is very important in bringing these two disparate worlds together.

Day after day after day, Arab militants and then Israelis on the other side are engaging in a bloody battle. This is a war. This has accelerated to more than a conflict. I believe our foreign policy on this issue is wrong.

It pains me, as we move to some of the humblest and most sacred times in the Jewish community here in the United States and across the world, two of their most important holidays over the next 2 to 3 weeks in the United States will be honored, and of course in Israel and around the world. Would it not be a wonderful tribute then to say that we are reengaged, that we want to save lives, that we want them to come to the peace table, and we say, ''Stop the accusations, Arafat come to the table, Sharon come to the table, release yourselves from the strictures of hatred, and begin to talk about real issues of saving lives and living harmoniously together''?

I believe this is an enormously important issue and would ask the President and the administration and his advisers to wake up and understand the importance of U.S. involvement.

Let me conclude by answering my colleague's comments on 245(i). As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, it is wrong headed to interpret this particular legislative initiative as a general amnesty. All it is is because the Immigration and Naturalization Service made a mistake. They made a mistake with a date, they made a mistake administratively.

This is simply to allow those who are in the process of filing for legalization 10, 15 years ago, to reactivate their applications.

□ 1900

Many of these people are family members who need to be reunited. Many of these people come from many

parts of the world. It is not isolated to people from Mexico. It is not isolated to people from South America. It includes people from Poland, from France, from India, from all continents around the world. It is simply an administrative snafu which is allowing people who legally apply to reapply and to follow the legal process. It is not an affirmation. It means the INS has to make a decision one way or the other.

THE BUDGET AND THE ECONOMY; MISSILE DEFENSE, AND SEX AND INTERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, this evening I want to talk about a number of different issues with my colleagues.

As my colleagues know, we have just come back from our August recess and there are some issues that have come up. First of all, I hope later in the week to talk a little more about natural resources and talk about our public lands. I was up in Alaska and had the privilege to enjoy Mt. McKinley and Denali National Park. Beautiful. Alaska, as we all know, is a great, great State and I learned a lot on my trip up there.

I also spent a good deal of time back in my district, the Third Congressional District of Colorado, which many of my colleagues know includes almost all of the mountains of Colorado. In fact, the Third Congressional District of Colorado geographically is larger than the State of Florida. And of the 67 or so mountains above 14,000 feet in the United States, 53 of them are located in my district. It is the highest district in the Nation. As a result, there are a lot of things that are particular to the Third Congressional District not found in many other districts in the country.

Seventy-five percent of the land in this Nation, including Alaska, 75 percent of the land above 10,000 feet is in the Third Congressional District of Colorado. The Third Congressional District contains the majority or the largest amount of ski resorts of any congressional district in the United States, world-renowned resorts in Aspen, Colorado; Vail, Telluride, Durango, Steamboat, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So I hope later this week to get an opportunity to address my colleagues on some of the issues like public lands, like water, like wilderness areas, national parks, and national monuments because these issues are very important.

But tonight I want to talk about a couple of other subjects. I would like to visit for a few minutes about the President and the budget and the economic situation that we are in. As many of my colleagues know, I serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, and that committee is working very hard on both sides of the aisle to try to figure out some answers to what would be the appropriate government interaction in regards to the economy.

I would also like to talk about missile defense and the importance of missile defense. And the third thing I would like to talk about, and which I will start out at the very beginning with, is sex and interns.

I have come under a great deal of criticism in the last month when I have addressed the issues of inappropriate relationships between a United States Congressman, and I am speaking generically here, no specific Congressman, but speaking generically of the United States Congress and exactly what its ethics rules are in regards to inappropriate relationships with interns. That, I have received criticism for.

I have had people across the Nation, editorials across the Nation asking why would I think we need an ethical rule in the United States Congress to say that a sexual relationship with an intern is inappropriate? Well, we need that rule in the United States Congress for the same reason that we find that very rule, that very specific content in rules in every educational institution in the United States.

I defy any of my colleagues and I defy any of those editorial boards to pinpoint for me one high school in this Nation, to show me one college in this Nation that allows a teacher or a professor to have a sexual relationship or an inappropriate relationship with a student. They do not allow it. A teacher, a professor who engages in a sexual relationship with a student, they are gone. They are fired.

It was this body not very many years ago, as a result of Tailhook in the United States Navy, that addressed this with the Department of Defense and the executive agencies. They have very specific rules in our military. A commanding officer engaging in a sexual relationship with a consenting adult, an adult who is consenting but falls below them in the hierarchy of command, is gone. That fast. It does not matter. Why? Because they have a position of authority over the person they are having that sexual relationship with.

That is exactly what we have in the United States Congress. We have a position of authority over these interns. But in a lot of these cases these interns, in almost all these cases these interns are students. Now, sure, by the technical definition, these students are adults. I do not know what it is in D.C., maybe 15 or 16. So, theoretically, if they are above statutory rape age, 15 or 16 years old, they are an adult.

So some of these editorials and even some of my colleagues have said to me, hey, they are grown up. Give me a break. Why does the field of medicine, doctors, prohibit themselves from having sex with patients? It is considered an inappropriate relationship and it is in their ethics. They can lose their medical license for an inappropriate relationship. Why does the clergy prohibit it? Because a clergy person, a priest or a minister, is not supposed to have an inappropriate relationship with a parishioner. It is against their ethical rules, their in-house rules. Why does the legal profession, lawyers, prohibit by the ethics of their bars their members from having an inappropriate relationship with their clients? It is because they exercise a great deal of influence over people.

Now, what I have proposed, contrary to some of the news reports across the Nation, is not precedent setting. It is not some novel idea that I came up with. It is simply taking the language that applies in the military, that applies in the clergy, that applies in the teaching profession, that applies in the medical profession, that applies in the legal profession and apply it to the one institution in this country that has no ethical rule about it, to the best of my knowledge, and that is the United States Congress.

I am not saying going out there and trying to legislate morality. My proposal is not a piece of legislation. I have not introduced a bill. What I have asked is the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to give me an opinion as to whether or not under current ethics regulations, and it is clearly not clear, but under current ethics regulations if this type of relationship is prohibited. And if it is not prohibited, I have asked for an in-house rule, not legislation. We are not trying to draft a bill. I am not trying to legislate morality, I am just trying to say the same rules that prohibit us from misuse of government credit cards, for example, or things like that, that we put this in there as well. Just like every other major institution.

Now, remember, these interns are in the United States Congress. First of all, the internship program is what I care the most about, and I want to see that program preserved. It makes me sick that the late night talk shows spend a good deal of their jokes about interns in Washington, D.C. I have seen editorial cartoons across the Nation, and one in particular where they show an intern in a life raft, and I saw this the other day, an intern in a life raft, and her legs are hanging over the side. Underneath the life raft are a bunch of sharks and they have Congressmen as the names for the sharks.

I can say to the parents who have interns back here, that this is an exception, this type of inappropriate conduct with an intern. This is a program that has made many changes in young people's lives, and these are young people. These students and interns are not hard to determine who they are. Back here in the United States Congress, interns have separate IDs. Interns have a separate pay classification. They are back here as students of government. The interns are students of government and we are the teachers. We as the Congressmen exercise a disproportionate

amount of influence, a disproportionate amount of authority over these young students, and we ought to have certain responses that we follow.

I saw last week where somebody asked, why do we need a rule; our own moral beliefs ought to tell us we should not have an inappropriate relationship. Well, why do schools need rules; why do high schools or colleges need them? Why does the clergy, the medical or legal profession need them? Because of the fact there are some people who pay attention to those rules. In my opinion, every Congressman that is now serving today, all 435 of us, reads the rules. And I would venture to say that all of us, or almost all of us, when we read the rules, we will modify our behavior so that we fall in compliance with those rules. If the rules say that we cannot send out constituent mail, say, with political advertising in it, I would venture to say that most Congressmen do not send out congressional mail with political advertising because the rules prohibit it. They follow the rules.

So what I have suggested here is not something that should be deserving of ridicule in editorials or under-the-breath talk by some of my colleagues, because what we are trying to do is preserve the internship program. A poll was just recently conducted, and parents were asked if they would trust the Congressmen to send their children back to, their students, their young people, back to be interns. Of course, as you might guess, the answer was overwhelmingly no.

This is a program that a lot of my colleagues came through themselves. This is a program that has exposed the young people to the American government and its workings. Every intern in my office, I believe, will remember their internship in Washington, D.C. in a very positive fashion, and it has made a significant change in their life. So I think it is important to preserve this program.

Now, I have three children, two daughters that are internship age. One is 22 and the other one is 19. Both of them have been back here in Washington, D.C. And as a parent I want to know, as every parent wants to know with their young son or daughter, that when they are back there they are in a professional relationship. They are back there in a relationship that has a fiduciary responsibility so that they do not have to worry about the Congressman exerting influence over their child. And they are still students. I do not care whether they are technically adults. The fact is they are students of government.

Do not forget, in college, or in the military, if a professor in his or her class has a student that, say, is 25 years old, the age does not matter. It is the fact they are a student and it is the fact that there is a position of authority over the student and that is why these educational institutions across the Nation prohibit inappropriate relationships.

Now, some people have suggested I not take the floor to discuss this. I feel it is important, because I think it is getting a little out of hand. Not the inappropriate relationships, because contrary to popular belief, in my opinion, most of the Congressmen in these chambers, if not all, and I am not aware of others, all of the Congressmen I know maintain themselves in a professional mode. They are highly ethical when it comes to the treatment of interns and there is not widespread abuse in the internship program. But the perception that has gone out there is in part caused by the fact that our own ethics do not prohibit it, or apparently there is some confusion as to whether our ethics prohibit those types of relationships.

So we owe it to the internship program, we owe it to the program to put forth a proper in-house rule. Not legislation. We are not legislating morality, we are putting in our own in-house rule, the kind of prohibition that, as I have said three or four times in these comments, the same kind of prohibition that exists in our churches, exists in our schools, exists in our hospitals, and exists in our courts.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say I would be interested to look at some of the major news networks who waste editorial space on me, I would venture to say most of them probably have prohibitions against inappropriate relationships with their student interns that are in there to learn how to be journalists. I would ask my colleagues to support me and publicly acknowledge that it is appropriate for us to have in our House rules a rule which prohibits inappropriate relationships with interns.

I will wrap it up with this: Let me say that we are talking specifically about interns. I am not talking about a congressman who may choose to go outside of his or her marriage and have a relationship with someone who does not work as a student intern or one staff member dating another staff member. I am not talking about those kinds of relationships.

What I am talking about, very, very specifically what I am talking about is a congressman and a student intern. I cannot stress enough that these interns are students. They are students of the government. We do not have to use interns, by the way. As a congressman, we are not required to hire interns. But if we do, we ought to assume some professional responsibility. As I have mentioned several times before, all of my colleagues that I know do assume that professional responsibility, contrary to popular perception. Whether Democrat or Republican, they handle their interns on a professional basis when I have seen them. But I think the internship program, and certainly the reputation, is in danger because of the fact of some of the things that have gone on.

Mr. Speaker, I think one way to help rebuild the reputation is to at least put in place a rule; and then if somebody breaks that rule, let them suffer the consequences. We have a process for that. We have checks and balances in that process. There is absolutely no reason that the United States Congress should not have a House rule prohibiting inappropriate relationships between a congressman and a student intern.

Let me move on briefly to cover a couple of points. During the break, the liberal side of the Democratic Party has been lambasting President Bush on this tax cut. What the liberal side of the Democratic Party seems to be forgetting is that my good colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), introduced an amendment on this House floor, and that amendment was a tax cut. That amendment called for a tax rebate. It was very similar, not exact, but very similar. Certainly pretty close to exact in concept, but it was very similar to what the President put into place.

The debate here on the floor was not the amount of money of the tax cut, the debate was between the Democrats and the Republicans, and really between the liberal side of the Democratic Party because several of the conservative Democrats supported President Bush's program for tax cuts, so it was not a clear Democratic/Republican bill, but the Democrats that opposed it, their primary argument after listening to hours and hours of debate, was not about the amount of money, but it was focused on who should get the rebate.

Those Democrats said that the tax rebate should go to people who paid payroll taxes but paid no income taxes. The Republicans and the Democrats who supported the Bush program countered that argument by saying the people who ought to get the tax rebate back are people who paid taxes in. You should not give a tax rebate to people who had no tax liability. That is where the intensity of the debate focused.

Now because our economy continues to go south, which everyone acknowledges, it really started to do that about 6 months before President Clinton left office, but now that the economy continues to go south, instead of joining together as a team, which is what the American people are demanding, we are seeing the Democrats starting to pile on President Bush, and I heard over the weekend one of the leaders said Bush is the architect of this bad economy.

What does he mean? Does my colleague think Bush went out and designed a bad economy? Does my colleague think any of us are comfortable that our economy is going back and continues to worsen? No. But there are some people who are going to use this bad economy, and some people in leadership positions throughout this country, that want to use this bad economy for their own political advantage. They are not worrying about what do we do for the American people to improve

this economy, but instead trying to figure out how can we win the elections next year by monopolizing on how terrible this economy is and doing the blame game.

The time has come. We cannot allow this economy to continue to go in its downward direction and perhaps get into an uncontrollable spiral just because you want political advantage next year in the elections. Every one of us, the Democrats, the Republicans, have an obligation to come together as a team. Sure we will have some debates, but our primary focus ought to be what can we do in working with the President of the United States to try and get this economy to at least level out or hopefully begin a recovery. There are a lot of unique situations about the economy that we face today. One of those is that the entire world is in an economic recession. Many of the countries, a lot of the countries in the world are in an economic recession. The world is in an economic slowdown. The United States is swaying back and forth as to whether or not we go into that economic recession.

Mr. Speaker, so in a time like this, there is a demand for us to work together as a team for the benefit of the American people so that they have a healthy economy. I would advise my colleagues, take a look at the Sunday talk shows, and take a look at which one of our colleagues really want to work as a team to improve this economy or really want to take advantage of the sour economy for political purposes for next year's elections. If you know some of them, obviously you know who the ones are that want to take political advantage, you ought to say, I understand that we want political advantage, but maybe we better pay attention to what is happening. While we are preparing for next year's elections, the ship has a big hole in its side. We are taking on a lot of water. We may be so worried about next year's elections, by the time we get that secured and take a look at the boat, we may have too much water to save the boat. I expect now that we are back in session that we are going to see people popping up here and there trying to take political advantage of this economy.

On the other hand, if my colleagues want to see examples of leadership, take a look at which Members of those parties stand up and are willing to walk back and forth across this aisle and say, Hey, as team, what are we going to do on this economy? How are we going to control spending? Are we going to need further tax cuts?

The Democrats over the weekend on national television on the Sunday shows acknowledged that additional tax cuts may be necessary. Why are they necessary? We need to get more money into the economy. That is why the interest rates have been lowered. That is why Greenspan lowered the interest rate. That is why President Bush put into effect his tax cut. That is why we are talking about additional tax cuts, and we need to figure out in what areas of the country government spending makes some sense, and what do we need to do about deficit spending. Will deficit spending become a necessity to prevent the country from going into a recession?

Mr. Speaker, I have some ideas to those questions, and I take it upon myself to have the responsibility, and I think most of my colleagues do, and I hope all of them do, to assume that responsibility to come across that aisle and talk.

I invite the liberal Democrats, put down your arms and come across and help us come up with a solution because in the end, maybe next year's elections you will have an advantage, but in the meantime, you may very well be a participant in driving this ship to the bottom of sea, and now is our time to avoid it.

I hope to see some effort of cooperation from the Democratic side and from the Republican side in an effort to improve our economy, or at least get this country going in a positive recovery from where we are right now.

Mr. Speaker, for the balance of my time I would like to talk about missile defense. I think missile defense has been mischaracterized in the last month. There are a number of issues of missile defense that I want to discuss.

First of all, we will talk about the anti-ballistic missile treaty. I want to talk about the capabilities that this country is going to need for the future, about the weaknesses that we have, about the responsibilities and the obligations we have to the next generation in regards to the defense of this country.

This country is not the most popular country in the world. It certainly is the strongest country in the world, the strongest country in the history of the world. This country has done more than any other country in the history of the world. This country has some of the best of everything. But it is all at risk if we do not continue to defend ourselves. We have to be on constant alert that somebody else wants something we have or somebody else wants to do harm to us.

I had a group of high school students in my office, and we began to talk and we talked about defense. I can tell Members, the students today are smart young men and women. They are very thoughtful, and they look into the future. We talked about defense.

I asked them, I said what student do you think in your school gets in the least amount of fights. One said the person who is in the best shape, the person that is the strongest, the toughest. Not the person that picks the fights, but the person that avoids people picking a fight with them. That is right.

If you have in your class or group of friends, if you have somebody who is a black belt in karate, and everybody knows that and everybody knows if they decide to take them on they are probably going to get their nose busted, how many people are going to fight with the person that is a black belt in karate? But the moment they notice the person with the black belt in karate is no longer staying in shape, when they notice that person is not practicing, getting overweight, his or her moves are not what they used to be and really kind of just becoming lazy, what happens? Somebody then begins to take a look, and then the temptation starts.

Maybe now when they are not properly defending themselves and not staying in shape, maybe now is the time to take that person on; and it is the same thing with the United States of America. We are in pretty good shape right now, but we cannot bank on the good shape we have been in in the past. We have to bank on how well we keep ourselves in shape for the future. What do we have in regards to military apparatus and defense.

I know there are a number of people out there that say and kind of go on the theory we should stop military spending and we should limit defense spending, and do it in peaceful discussion. We should settle things in peaceful ways. And I have interest, in the last year there seem to be a lot more people saying violence has no place in our society.

Well, I am here to tell Members violence does have a place in society. That is exactly how we took care of Hitler, and that is exactly what our police officers do. But these people are correct that while violence is sometimes necessary, it ought to be the last remedy that we use.

Obviously we need to have the ability to communicate, and communication is a very important part of a Nation's defense. That is why our Secretary of State, and fortunately we have an excellent Secretary of State in Colin Powell, that is why the position is so critical. That is why we have ambassadorships.

One of the best elements of our defense is communication with other countries. Talk to people. Have the ability to negotiate. Have the ability to try and understand where they are coming from; but sometimes that fails. We saw it in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1930

Despite repeated warnings by the President, that country failed to communicate; and we gave them every chance, and finally we had to resort to violence; but as I said, it should be the last remedy.

When we talk about our country, we need to talk about something. Let us look back, for example, in history, in the sixties and the seventies, about 30 years ago. At that time, as you know, the Russian empire was in existence, U.S.S.R., Soviet Union, Communist, threatening to take over the world, Krushchev and people like that had been their previous leaders, talked very

strongly about the United States was the number one enemy.

The United States knew that it had to build up and they did so, and even in the Kennedy years and so on; and we had the Cuban missile crisis and so on, we began to build up.

Somebody came up with an idea that said, you know, Russia has got a lot of nuclear missiles and the United States has a lot of nuclear missiles; maybe what we ought to do is sign a treaty between the two, communicate between the two and a treaty should be what we call the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, and this is very, very important.

The Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty as its concept, as its original thought of the basis of this treaty says that one country cannot defend itself against the other countries.

Now, remember, that the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, often called obviously ABM, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. The Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty which was executed, signed, only had two parties to it. There are only two parties that are subject to the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty.

Why only two parties in the 1970s? Because there were only two parties that were capable of delivering a nuclear missile upon the land of another country, and they were the United States and the U.S.S.R. That is why you had two parties.

Well now, today, how many parties to the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty? Well, theoretically only one because the U.S.S.R. does not exist anymore. The Communist regime fell. But realistically let us say two, still two. Now remember, back in 1970 there were only two countries capable of delivering one missile into another country, only two. That was in the 1970s.

What is it today? I do not know: 12, 14. There are lots of countries today. You can start off with China. You can move to India. You can move to Pakistan. You can talk about Israel. You can talk about Iran. You can talk about North Korea. You can talk about South Korea. There are a lot of countries today who are not subject to this Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. So based on that alone, the treaty needs to be modified or eliminated.

Let me tell you that when this treaty was drafted, the thought of it was one country would not build a defense. They would agree not to defend themselves against missiles. So the United States agreed not to build a missile defense system. Russia, at the same time, the U.S.S.R., the Communist regime, agreed they would not build a missile defensive system. The theory being that the United States would not fire upon Russia because they knew Russia would retaliate and we would have no defense because we do not have a missile defensive system; and obviously it works the same thing with Russia.

Well, the people that drafted this, while I disagree with that concept, that is clearly the basis upon which the treaty was drafted; and while I do disagree with that, I can tell you that the drafters of that document had a lot of foresight in that they knew that as time moved on there may be other circumstances that were unforeseen that entered the picture.

Therefore, they put within the four corners of this agreement a clause. They put a clause in there that said that this agreement, they could end the treaty, that the treaty could be abrogated and they called for that. That is a right of the treaty. It is a basic right in the treaty.

Now, President Bush has said and the administration has said that the United States could very well terminate that treaty because of our best interests and the risks we have against the best interests of the American people. I have noticed that, frankly, some of the more liberal journalists in the country have said what do you mean you are going to abrogate that treaty? What do you mean you are going to walk away from the ABM treaty? You cannot do that.

Read the treaty. Read the treaty. Of course you can do that. It is a fundamental right. It is in the language of the treaty. Of course you can do that, because the people who drafted that 32 years ago knew that in 32 years things might change; and boy, have they changed.

Who would have ever imagined 32 years ago that North Korea could deliver a nuclear missile? Who could have ever imagined the fire power of China or India or Pakistan or Israel or other countries in the Middle East or Iran? And not just with nuclear warheads, but with biological warheads as well.

Look, we are kidding ourselves, and I can tell you that as Congressmen we have an absolutely inherent obligation, a fiduciary obligation to the American people to provide the American people a defense, a military defense against the aggressiveness of another country. We are fools, we are kidding ourselves, if we continue to think that we should not build a missile defense for this country.

In Colorado Springs, Colorado, there is a mountain. It is called Cheyenne Mountain. Cheyenne Mountain is a granite monument, a beautiful mountain. Years ago on the inside of that mountain, they went out and they bored out the center of that mountain. They took the granite out of the center of the mountain, or a portion of it out of the mountain, and they put in there the NORAD defense detection. Inside that mountain, we have the capabilities of detecting within seconds, anywhere in the world, a missile launch. We can within seconds tell you where that launch took place, where the trajectory is of that particular missile, what type of missile we think it is, what kind of warheads we think it has on it. We can tell you where its target is. We can give you the estimated time of arrival.

So let us say that North Korea launches a missile, or let us say China launches a missile. Let us say that the target is Oklahoma City, the military base in Oklahoma City. We have the capability, we have it today, we have the most advanced technology in the history of the world. We can immediately know within a couple of seconds we have got a missile launch, it is coming out of China, it is headed for Oklahoma and it is going to hit in 15 minutes. Then what can we do?

All we can do is call Oklahoma. Governor, you have got an incoming missile. Sorry, Governor, we decided not to provide a missile defense for this country. Sorry, Governor. We had a lot of people that said we should live by the laws of 30 years ago. Sorry, Governor, we pretended that that threat out there did not exist, even though in fact, Governor, we knew it existed. And sorry, Governor, there is nothing we can do. You are going to have a missile hit in about 13 minutes. God bless you. We will think of you in the future.

That is all we can do today. President Bush has had enough guts to stand up and several Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, have had enough guts to stand up and say, uh-oh, we better stop, enough time has gone by, we better pay attention to our responsibilities to the American people. We need to put in place a missile defense system.

Missile defense is very complicated. Obviously, we are going to have to research it. Take a look at how much research it took to fly an airplane. Take a look at the money we spent on the space program. Take a look at how much research there was to figure out a TV. You do not just go out there and wave the magic wand and have a perfect missile defense system.

Some of my colleagues are saying, Oh, my gosh, we don't have one ready today to go, so we shouldn't build one. Is that ludicrous? Is that crazy? We do not have the technology today, although we do have the technology today, but we do not have one in place, so let us not build one because we have to spend too much time on research.

Give me a break. Of course we have got to spend time on research. We need to get a system that is perfected. And it is going to take some time. But we have no time to spare. If we start today, if we give the President the money that the President has requested to put a missile defense system in place, it will still be several years down the road before we can deploy that missile defense system. In the meantime, China has built up more, Iran has built up more, Iraq has built up more, North Korea; and I can go right down through the list. Times have changed.

What do we have to do with a missile defense system? You, in effect, have two missiles, two bullets speeding through the sky. You have got to be able to connect your missile defense, it may be a land-based missile, has got to be able to hit this incoming missile. It

is like hitting a bullet with a bullet. They are both traveling at very, very fast speeds. You have got to be able to connect them. You cannot just do it with a land-based missile.

The best place to stop an enemy missile is where? Where is the best place to stop an enemy missile? On their launching pad. Not while it is over New York City or over the continental United States, but stop that missile when they are getting ready to launch it. How do you do that? You cannot do it with a land-based missile in the United States. You have got to do it with some kind of space technology. You have got to be able to do it with laser.

Every peace-loving person in America who is against war, and I guess we are all against war, but who is anti-military or is against violence, you ought to be the strongest proponents there are for missile defense. Because what happens if that missile leaves the launching pad? Think. For example, a big danger today is not necessarily an intentional launch of a missile. A big danger today is somebody pushes a button by accident.

What if we had an accidental launch of a missile incoming to the United States? I mean, if we had the capability to stop that and we confirmed that it was an accident, we may have just stopped the next war. We may have stopped nuclear oblivion because of the fact we were able to stop it before it did harm and determined that it was an accidental launch.

Today as somebody launches a missile, let us say that Russia, by accident, launches a nuclear missile or launches a nuclear missile with multiple warheads on it so that the missile comes into the United States and fires multiple warheads and hits several different targets. How convinced do you think the United States is going to be that that was an accident? What do you think our response would be? We could very easily end up with a nuclear war on our hands. So even those of you who are big proponents of no violence, and I hope you are successful in your efforts, by the way, but realistically I do not think you will be, but let us say those of you who are absolutely opposed to violence, you ought to be the strongest proponents there are of a missile defense system, because the best way to avoid that violence is to take away the tool of violence that they have, and that is a missile that they could deliver to the United States.

So you have several different stages that you want to develop so that you can take out an incoming enemy missile or a missile launched by mistake. One, you want to be able to get it on the launching pad. Ideally, that is the best place to do it. If it gets off the launching pad, you want to be able to, at any different time, have satellite laser beam technology that hopefully can destroy that over the ocean. Then, finally, if it gets into the United States, over into our airspace, you want to have the capability of not only satellite laser beam but you also want to have the capability of ground-based or some other ship-based type of missile that could go up and collide with that missile and take that missile out.

About 2 months ago, we had a successful test. They fired a missile and they fired an intercept missile and we hit them. That is pretty good. Think about it. You cannot miss by this far. You have got to hit. That missile is not that big around. When you take a look at the warhead on top of a missile, it is maybe the width of a car, so you have got to bring those two cars together out there going at the kinds of speeds that they are going at, and they have got to be able to hit. The test the other day was a successful test. We were able to calculate it. So it is a good step.

But I am amazed at the people who, number one, criticize the President. He, by the way, is the one whom we charge with the leadership of this country. We say to President Bush, President Bush, you better take a look at this treaty. Are you protecting this country? You are in charge of it. You are the President. You are the guy that we are holding responsible to make sure that we can go to work every day without being concerned about being dragged into some kind of war or having a missile attack against us.

□ 1945

Yet we tell them on this end, on this hand we say you are spending too much money, you are dreaming about missile technology that may or may not exist.

The fact is, Mr. President, I am proud of you. We need a missile defense system in this country, and we need it, and we have needed it for some period of time; a leader of this country, to finally stand up and say to Russia, look, Russia, we will even share with you our capability to defend ourselves, but you better acknowledge, Russia, that there are no longer two countries in this world capable of firing missiles at each other. That number is in the tens and twenties, maybe even the high twenties, of countries capable; and every month, every year that goes by, some other nation out there is developing the capability to deliver a missile into another country.

We have got finally a President who has got enough guts to stand up and say, all right, it is time to get back in shape. It is time to build a military missile defense system for the protection of this country and its allies.

Of interesting note, the Europeans, as you know, probably the Brits, some of the strongest allies we have ever had, good allies out there, they are standing up for us. They want a missile defense system. Take a look at the Italians. The Italians, their Prime Minister, they support this.

So do not be misled by the national media that may say the Europeans say that this could throw off the balance of power, and that the United States is a warmonger because they are trying to deploy a missile defense system. You watch what happens in Europe. You watch what the French do and some of the other people do over in those European countries once we perfect that technology. They are going to be at our front door. They are going to be at our front door with their Xerox machines, saying, look, can we get a copy of what you have got, because we too have an obligation to defend the people of our country.

As far as I am concerned, I would like to see every nation in the world have a defense apparatus so that they could stop incoming missiles, because I really, really am concerned, really concerned, about an accidental missile launch.

Now, some people who are, I guess, theoretical in the concept of peace, say, well, everybody should agree not to fire a missile. Everybody should lay down their arms. All we have to do is look at the Middle East. I mean, look, there are inherent things of human nature, and we better accept them, and most of us have accepted the fact that there will always be somebody who is not willing to lay down their arms, and as long as one people has their arms, you better be willing to defend against it. The United States, because of our prominence in the world, because we are such a strong power, will always have somebody who wants to take us on, who wants to launch a missile against the best interests of the citizens of the United States.

Now, we have some appropriation battles coming up here pretty soon. We know the basis of our economy. It is requiring that we tighten our belt, like every other American citizen, that we manage the Federal budget just like the American families have to manage their own home budget, and we have to take a look at what programs are priority programs.

The President has made it very clear that there are a couple of priorities for him, and when he says ''for him,'' he speaks of his concept for the country. In other words, there are a couple of programs that are of priority for the Nation.

The first one, education. The President has asked for a considerable increase in appropriations and in reform, regulation, regarding education; testing, accountability, and more money for education.

That is pretty hard to argue, although, as you might guess, on our floor we manage to find argument about it. But education is one of the priorities of this President.

The other appropriation he is talking about is the military. Now, remember, when we talk about military, in excess of 70 percent of our military budget goes for salaries and wages. We have got to pay these men and women that are serving this country something above the poverty level. We have to be able to provide for them. So we have to be able to take that into consideration.

But one of his priorities contained within that military priority is military defense. I am suggesting to my colleagues, no, I am not suggesting to my colleagues, I am telling you, the time has come. We have got to work with the President on a military missile defense system. We cannot continue to waste any more time. We have an obligation to the next generation, to my kids, to your kids, to your grandkids, to my grandkids, we have an obligation to provide a defense apparatus in this Nation so that they do not live under the threat of an accidental missile launch or an intentional missile launch against the United States of America.

We are the ones today that make those decisions for tomorrow. That is why we were elected. We were not elected to sit here and not think about tomorrow. The President has said to the United States Congress, think about education tomorrow. What are the results tomorrow? And it is the same thing with our military defense. Think about tomorrow, because, before you know it, tomorrow is here, and we have added many, many more countries in the world that have that capability to launch missiles.

Mr. Speaker, let me show this poster. Take a look at today. I am talking about nuclear warheads. But do not forget that on a missile you can also deliver biological or chemical warheads. Take a look. Every spot on this map is a country that is capable of delivering known or probable biological and chemical programs, and they can deliver those chemicals with a missile.

Now, remember, in 1970 when that treaty, the antiballistic missile treaty was drafted, there were two countries, the United States and the USSR, there were only two countries in the world that had to be concerned about that. But, because of this expansion, things have changed.

I want to stress to my colleagues, because this argument continues to come up again and again and again, and in my opinion it has no validity, and that argument is the proposition that we cannot build a missile defense system without violation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, which we have no right to exit from.

What I am saying here tonight is that Antiballistic Missile Treaty, fortunately, the people who drafted it, as I mentioned earlier, I disagree with the concept that the treaty was drafted 30 years ago, but fortunately the people who drafted that treaty had the foresight to say, gosh, over a period of time the consequences may change to the extent that the United States and the USSR ought to be able to walk away from this treaty; that the consequences are of such importance that it justifies withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

I think the President is justified in taking the position that with all of the countries today that can accidentally or intentionally launch a missile into the United States, that the circumstances have changed dramatically enough that the United States has to take a new approach; that the United States can no longer afford, can no longer afford to sit by and pretend that in our future there will be no missile attack against the United States.

In fact, it is just the opposite. The United States must prepare today for tomorrow and for the future generations, prepare for the expectation that in fact a missile at some point or another will be launched against the United States of America, either intentionally or accidentally.

But once that missile is airborne, it does not much matter as far as the consequences of the missile hit. But it does matter if we are able to stop that missile, let us say, on its launching pad; and let us say we are able to determine it was an accidental launch, that somebody made a mistake, that some mechanism, a malfunction, and we were able to stop a war or we were able to stop American retribution, which you know because of our capabilities would be severe, harsh, and instantaneous; that we were able to avoid that because we had in place a system that was capable of stopping an attack against the United States.

So I urge every one of my colleagues, instead of playing the political rhetoric game, which I am beginning to see emerge up here, against the missile defense system, put that political rhetoric aside for the benefit of the future generations of the United States of America. Try and put in place a vision for the future, a future that allows the people and the population of the United States, and the friends of the United States of America, the capability of making a missile attack a nonissue, because we have the capability to stop it.

For those of you who want to end violence or at least do what you can to minimize violence, you, as I said earlier, should be the strongest proponents we have for a missile defense system. So I congratulate the President, I congratulate the administration, and, frankly, I commend both Democrats and Republicans on the House floor that are coming across this aisle to stand in unison in favor of a missile defense system for this country.

Let me just reiterate a couple points I made earlier. It is appropriate and it is timely for the United States Congress to put in our rules a rule which prohibits inappropriate conduct between a Congressman and an intern.

I spent a good deal of time at the beginning of my remarks explaining why I have pursued this issue. I spent a good deal of time pointing out that we are the only major institution, the U.S. Congress is the only major institution in United States that does not have a prohibition against inappropriate relationships between a Congressman and an intern. For example, the teaching profession, every school in the Nation prohibits it; the medical profession prohibits it; the military prohibits it; the clergy prohibits it; the legal profession prohibits it; most major corporations prohibit it. The United States Congress ought to follow good example. It is not precedent breaking. We should set a good example, follow a good example, and put in place a rule that prohibits that type of inappropriate conduct.

Finally, as my final remarks, I urge all of us to stand as a team to address this economy. This is not a laughing matter. This is a very serious situation. We are in a tunnel, we are not out the other side of it, and there is a train coming in. We need to stand in unison to figure out how to get out of that tunnel. And there is light. We can get out of the tunnel, but the more bickering and partisanship that we see on this House floor, the less likely that we can fulfill our leadership responsibilities and obligations and lead our country into some type of economic recovery.

NEGATIVE IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AKIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond, if I can, briefly, to some of the comments that my colleague from Colorado made with regard to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do realize that we in Congress all have an obligation, certainly, to work for economic recovery, and there is, of course, a great deal of concern about the economy right now because of some of the indications we have had over the last week with regard to the stock market, with regard to some of the unemployment figures that have come through.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not point out, and this is really the gist of my comments this evening, I do not intend to use the full hour, but I need to spend a little time reiterating once again the negative impact of President Bush's tax cut, the tax cut that was supported by the majority of the Republicans, who are the majority here in the House of Representatives, and which I think has had a very negative impact and certainly over the long term will have a very negative impact on the economy. And my fear that it is going to lead to President Bush suggesting and the Republican majority suggesting at some point, if it has not happened already, that we dip into the Medicare and the Social Security Trust Funds in order to pay for ongoing expenses with the Congressional budget, with the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, before we had the 4 weeks when we as Members of Congress were back in our districts during August, during the summer, we had been told over and over again by the President and the Republican leadership

that there was no need to worry about this tax cut, this huge massive tax cut that primarily benefited wealthy Americans, because we could have the tax cut and we would also be able to make sure that, even with the tax cut, that we would have enough money left over to pay for the national priorities that President Bush outlined, an education bill, a new defense initiative to make sure that the military was ready in the event of war, and also a Medicare prescription drug benefit. We could have the tax cut and we would also be able to have money left over for those national priorities.

We were also assured by the President and the Republican leadership that even with this massive tax cut that primarily favored the well-to-do, that we would have enough money for Social Security, that we would not dip into the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

□ 2000

Well, Democrats have been saying for over a year that none of those things were true; that the nature of the tax cut, the fact that it was so big, that what the President and the Republicans were proposing was so big, that it would basically make it impossible to not dip into the Medicare and Social Security trust funds and that there would not be any money left for any of those other priorities.

Well, we are there today. We went home at the end of July, early August, we came back, and lo and behold, the numbers have come back about the budget and what money is available; and the Congressional Budget Office, among other agencies, have told us that none of those things are true, that we probably have already dipped into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds because of this massive tax cut that the President insisted on as the sort of milestone and the main thing that we wanted to accomplish in the first year of his Presidency.

Just as some information, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office, this is from about a week or so ago, maybe it is 2 weeks now, the Congressional Budget Office confirmed what the Democrats have been saying for over a year, that the Bush tax cut is so big it forces the government to invade Social Security and Medicare trust funds. According to CBO, the government will be taking $30 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund and $170 billion from the Medicare trust fund over the next 5 years. The President talked about how in 2001, this fiscal year, we were going to have the second biggest surplus in history. But this year alone, the government is actually in deficit and must tap Medicare and Social Security to fund just routine government operations.

If we listen to what President Bush is saying, he pretty much has said, well, we may have to tap into the Social Security trust fund. He has talked about, well, maybe if the economy continues to deteriorate, that will be necessary. So I do not think there is any question, Mr. Speaker, that we are headed down that road.

It is a scary road because, first of all, I should point out before I talk about the negative consequences of this, the fact of the matter is, it could be a lot worse than even what the CBO is estimating now, because we have to remember that the Congressional Budget Office, in their making these projections that I talked about, these are baseline estimates, which basically assumes that there are no changes in spending. In other words, the CBO numbers do not assume that any of the other things that President Bush has talked about spending in this budget are going to happen, and it also assumes that the economy will pretty much stay the way it is rather than get any worse. If the economy worsens or if we tried to implement some of the things that the President has talked about, we could dip even further into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

I know that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), the gentleman who just spoke, said he does not really want to hear about this because after all, we are supposed to be united and we are not supposed to be bickering over who caused this problem. Well, it is not a coincidence. The Bush tax cut is the reason. In only 8 months, the President, President Bush has taken us from a situation where we had a healthy surplus that was basically built up under the 8 years of President Clinton's administration and was a major contributing factor to the fact that the economy was booming, and in just 8 months, this fiscal situation has dramatically reversed itself because of the policies of President Bush.

Now, I am not saying that I do not want to help solve the problem, but I have to lay the blame where the blame deserves to be placed. Things were good. The Federal Government was, for the first time, in surplus in the last 6 years of the Clinton administration. Now, in 8 months of the Bush administration, we are in a deficit once again.

Now, let me talk a little bit if I can, Mr. Speaker, about the consequences of this, because there are a lot of different consequences. There are various aspects as to what we are faced with here in terms of Federal policy and the negative consequences. I only mention it, not because I want to dwell on the negative, but because I want us to understand where we are so that we can do something about it in the future.

First of all, let me say I do not care what the other side says about this, the fact of the matter is that because we are now in this deficit situation, because of the Bush tax cut, we have destroyed any opportunity to spend any money on the national priorities that the President and others have talked about.

If we listen to President Bush, he still talks about his education initiative and how there is going to be money now that is going to go back to the States and local school boards and to the schools throughout the country that are going to beef up education. Let me assure my colleagues that the money is not there to pay for it. It is not going to happen. It is not going to happen unless we take the money from the Social Security trust fund. So I do not think it is going to happen.

Number two, the President keeps talking about his defense priorities. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) just mentioned a missile defense system. Well, I do not particularly like what the President is talking about in terms of a missile defense program; but whatever he is talking about: he talks about more money for the soldiers, he talks about more money for weapons, he talks about all of these billions of dollars that are going to be necessary to put us in a state of military preparedness. The money is not going to be there.

Mr. Speaker, these things are not going to happen. President Bush's tax cut destroyed any opportunity to spend money on education or on defense. Most of all, because these are the things that I hear most about from my constituents, I happen to have a district that has a higher proportion of senior citizens; and when I am home, as I was this weekend, they still talk to me about the high cost of prescription drugs and how they cannot afford it and how they would like to have Medicare include a prescription drugs program, which I have been a big supporter of. We have a health care task force on the Democratic side of the aisle. We have been working collectively to come up with a prescription drugs Medicare program, and we have endorsed several programs on the Democratic side that President Clinton talked about what he wanted to do to provide a prescription drugs program. Well, President Bush can tell us whatever he wants, but the money is not there, because of his tax cut, to pay for this Medicare prescription drug program.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that any of these national priorities that the President has identified: education, defense, or a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, will ever happen because of this tax cut and because of the situation that we face today.

Now, let me go on and talk a little more. It is not only that now, because of the tax cut, the Bush tax cut and the potential deficit that we do not have any money to spend on other priorities, but what is happening now is going to have a negative impact on the economy; and the fact of the matter is that what we do not have a surplus. And we are in a deficit situation. We hurt the economy; and we make it very, very difficult to have any economic recovery. If my colleagues on the Republican side are telling us that now they want to focus on what we can do to bring the economy back, certainly bypassing this

tax cut and putting us in a deficit situation, they have made it much, much harder for us to achieve any economic recovery.

Now, my colleagues do not have to take my word for it. Basically, we know that over the last year or so, the Federal Reserve has aggressively lowered short-term interest rates, but long-term interest rates have barely moved. They are still high. It was interesting, because at a July Senate Banking Committee hearing, we had Alan Greenspan, the Fed Chairman, and he very specifically indicated that the Bush tax cuts impact on the surplus in future years has prevented a decline in long-term interest rates.

The reason, a major reason why the economy was doing well during the Clinton era was because when President Clinton created a situation where there was a Federal surplus, it meant that the interest rates were low on their own, even without the Federal Reserve action; and it basically made it so that money was available. The Federal Government was not borrowing as much and taking money out of the system for lenders who wanted to use it to lend money to companies or factories so that they could build new factories and come up with new means of production and create more jobs. That drain that comes, the drain on the economy that comes from a Federal deficit is going to have a terribly negative impact on the economy and make it much more difficult for us to recover because the long-term interest rates will remain high, because it will be more difficult to borrow and raise capital for new production and create new jobs.

At this Senate Committee on Banking and Financial Services hearing, just to again reiterate that what I am saying is not pie in the sky, we had a little dialogue between the Federal Chairman Greenspan and Senator SCHUMER from New York. And if I could just repeat this, this was the Senator, or I do not know if I can use the word ''Senator,'' but a member of the other body who said, and I quote, ''One thing you mentioned, Mr. Greenspan, you thought that rates hadn't come down enough was that the rate of decline of Treasury debt had not been as great as we thought. Is that due to the tax cut?'' The Senator said. And Federal Chairman Greenspan said, ''I think it is basically due to a series of things. One, the tax cut.'' Senator SCHUMER says, ''Right. So the tax cut did have a negative effect on this?'' And Alan Greenspan says, ''Oh, yes, no question.''

So the Bush tax cut is not only making it difficult to spend any money on education, defense, Medicare prescription drugs, and may kill all of those things; but in addition, it is having a negative impact on the economy and it is going to be very, very difficult to achieve the kind of economic recovery that now the President and my Republican colleagues are saying should be a priority.

Lastly, and this I guess is the most obvious one, but I want to go into it a little bit. What is happening here now in terms of us going back into a deficit and, inevitably, it seems, spending the money from the Social Security and the Medicare trust fund, is that the money is not going to be available in the Medicare and Social Security trust funds to pay benefits.

Right now, the seniors that I represent, Medicare is probably the most important Federal program that they have available to them. Social Security is the most important program, because it is just, if not more important, because of the fact this they depend on the income from Social Security.

Well, right now we are okay. But we all know that in a few years, there will not be as much money available for Medicare and Social Security because the number of people who will become seniors, the so-called baby boom generation of which I am a part, when they get to be 65, there are going to be more of them and there is going to be a need for more money to pay out their retirement Social Security benefits and take care of their Medicare and take care of their health care needs.

So the reason that the Congress a few years ago started to build up this surplus in the trust funds for Medicare and Social Security was because they knew that maybe by 2020 or 2030, 20 or 30 years from now, if not sooner, but certainly by then, that there would be a lot more seniors and we would need more money to build up in this trust fund to pay out the benefits. Well, if we now dip into the Medicare and Social Security trust fund, this so-called surplus, that money is not going to be there.

Now, what the Democrats have been doing when Clinton was President was they recognized this and they said, okay, let us take a certain percentage of this surplus and general revenues that we have and let us dedicate it towards Social Security and Medicare. In other words, we had a Social Security and Medicare trust fund that had a surplus on their own, but President Clinton said, let us take money from the surplus we are building in general revenues from tax revenues and let us apply that to the Social Security and Medicare trust funds so that even more money would be available in 2020 or 2030 when we needed it. Well, that is all gone. There is nothing now; there is no general revenue surplus available to apply it to Social Security and Medicare. Instead, we are now taking from those trust funds to pay for general operations to operate the government.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty easy to figure out what is going on here, but the reality is very dire, because now there is a serious question about whether or not the Social Security and Medicare money will be available for people my generation when they get to be seniors.

□ 2015

Now, what I am going to mention now does not necessarily relate to the budget and to what the President did with his tax cut.

But ironically, in the middle of all of this, at the very time when President Bush's tax cut is having this negative impact and threatening Social Security and Medicare, we have the President, President Bush, setting up this commission, this Social Security commission that over the summer, including during the August break, started to provide all of this information about how they want to privatize Social Security. They may want to raise the age again when one gets Social Security.

There is all this potential tinkering with the Social Security system that I think is going to make the situation even worse, because if we privatize Social Security, or say to people that they can take a certain amount of their money outside the system and invest it in the stock market or in something else, there again, that is taking money away from the Social Security system that is not going to be available for the baby boom generation when they get to be 65.

Mr. Speaker, we no longer have the situation which we had under President Clinton and the Democrats where the general revenue surplus is being applied to boost up Social Security and Medicare. We now have a situation where President Bush's tax cut is probably going to make Congress, or maybe we are already doing it, dip into the trust funds for Social Security and Medicare.

At the same time, we have this commission out there that President Bush is instituting that is proposing to take even more money out of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds so that people can invest money in the stock market or whatever. I cannot imagine a worse situation.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize and I agree with my colleague, my Republican colleague who spoke before me, the gentleman from Colorado, that I do not want to just come here and talk about how bad things are. But if we do not recognize why they are getting bad, then we are never going to correct them.

This Congress has to think about ways of dealing with the fact that this tax cut has really hurt the economy, threatened Social Security, and makes it impossible for us to invest in other national priorities such as education, prescription drugs under Medicare, and defense needs.

Until we recognize the fact that this is the cause or a major cause of the problem, I do not know how we are going to correct it. I am not going to just stand here and put my head in the sand and say this is just happening through natural causes. This is happening because of the President and the Republican leadership's tax policy. That is why we are in the situation that we are in, and we need to recognize it before we can move on.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, September 11 and 12 on account of business in the district.

Mr. DEUTSCH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family business.

Mr. DOOLITTLE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GRUCCI (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of his mother had a heart attack.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and September 11 on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today and September 11.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the tenth annual meeting of the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 11, 2001, at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3518. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commuted Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Imports and Exports [Docket No. 00–017–1] received September 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3519. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Designation of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 01–080–1] received September 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3520. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation Prohibitions Because of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy [Docket No. 00–121–1] (RIN: 0579–AB26) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3521. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bromoxynil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301163; FRL–6798–2] (RIN: 2070–AB70) received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3522. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Buprofezin; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–301159; FRL–6796–6] received August 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3523. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pyriproxyfen; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301165; FRL–6798–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3524. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revocation of Unlimited Tolerance Exemptions [OPP–301152; FRL–6793–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3525. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301153; FRL–6793–3] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3526. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—B-D-Glucuronidase from E. coli and the Genetic Material Necessary for its Production As a Plant Pesticide Inert Ingredient; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–301129; FRL–6782–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3527. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2–Propenoic Acid, Sodium Salt, Polymer with 2–Propenamide; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–301158; FRL–6794–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3528. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reporting Requirements Update [DFARS Case 2001–D004] received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3529. A letter from the Alternative OSD FR Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Compensation of Certain Former Operatives Incarcerated by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (RIN: 0790–AG67) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3530. A letter from the Alternate OSD FR Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transactions Other Than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects (RIN: 0790–AG79) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3531. A letter from the Alternate OSD FR Liaison Office, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Service (CHAMPUS); Prosthetic Devices (RIN: 7020–AA49) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3532. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Flood Insurance Program; Assistance to Private Sector Property Insurers (RIN: 3067–AD23) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3533. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Records Preservation Program—received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3534. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions to the Control of Iron and Steel Production Installations [MD011/108–3056a; FRL–7040–8] received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3535. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—District of Columbia: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL–7050–9] received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3536. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of VOC Emissions from Marine Vessels Coating Operations [MD078–3078a; FRL–7049–3] received August 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3537. A letter from the Prinicpal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for

Electric Utility Steam Generating Units for Which Construction is Commenced After September 18, 1978; and Standards of Performance for Industrial—Commercial—Institutional Steam Generating Units—[FRL–7033–8] (RIN: 2060–AJ22) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3538. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidelines for Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements (DITCAs) for Fiscal Year 2001—received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3539. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Wisconsin [WI42–7306a; FRL–7029–3] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3540. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Pleasanton, Topeka, Iola, and Emporia, Kansas) [MM Docket No. 98–9, RM–9216; MM Docket No. 98–13, RM–9212] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3541. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hugo, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 01–91, RM–10096] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3542. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Salem and Molalla, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 01–59, RM–10072] (Avon and Fairport, New York) [MM Docket No. 01–60, RM–10073] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3543. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Missoula, Montana) [MM Docket No. 01–15, RM–10030] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3544. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Lexington, Kentucky) [MM Docket No. 01–83, RM–10085] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3545. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Charlottesville, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 00–240, RM–9793] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3546. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Kansas City, Missouri) [MM Docket No. 00–116, RM–9877] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3547. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Elkhorn City and Coal Run, Kentucky) [MM Docket No. 00–14, RM–9753] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3548. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Naches, Sunnyside, and Benton City, Washington) [MM Docket No. 01–95, RM–10093] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3549. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Panama City, Florida) [MM Docket No. 99–318, RM–9745] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3550. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Toccoa and Sugar Hill, Georgia) [MM Docket No. 98–162, RM–9263] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3551. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Open Access Same-Time Information System and Standards of Conduct [Docket No. RM95–9–014] received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3552. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [AAG/A Order No. 241–2001] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3553. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [AAG/A Order No. 242–2001] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3554. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Correction of Administrative Errors; Lost Earnings Attributable to Employing Agency Errors—received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3555. A letter from the Program Manager, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Identification Markings Placed on Firearms (98R–341P) [T.D. ATF–461; Ref: Notice No. 877] (RIN: 1512–AB84) received August 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3556. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Sister Bay MarinaFest, Sister Bay, Wisconsin [CGD09–01–055] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3557. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Maumee River, Toledo, Ohio [CGD09–01–112] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3558. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Candlelight on the Water, Port Washington, Wisconsin [CGD09–01–103] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3559. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Newport, RI [CGD01–01–100] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3560. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Triathlon, Ulster Landing, Hudson River, NY [CGD01–00–248] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3561. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Ashley River, Charleston, SC [CGD07–01–048] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3562. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: McArdle Bridge repairs—Boston, Massachusetts [CGD1–01–021] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3563. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–70–AD; Amendment 39–12382; AD 2001–16–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3564. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; BAe Systems (Operations) Limited Model Avro 146–RJ85A and 146–RJ100A Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–223–AD; Amendment 39–12384; AD 2001–16–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3565. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CFM International

CFM56 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001–NE–15–AD; Amendment 39–12405; AD 2001–17–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3566. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Bush River, Abingdon, Maryland [CGD05–01–047] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3567. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Nanticoke River, Sharptown, Maryland [CGD05–01–023] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3568. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Bayou Boeuf, LA [CGD08–01–026] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3569. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD08–01–023] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3570. A letter from the Senior Transportation Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Antidrug and Alcohol Misuse Prevention Programs for Personnel Engaged in Specified Aviation Activities [Docket No. FAA–2000–8431; Amendment No. 121–285] (RIN: 2120–AH15) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3571. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—FY02 Wetland Program Development Grants Guidelines [FRL–7047–9] received August 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3572. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Office of Research and Applications Ocean Remote Sensing Program Notice of Financial Assistance [Docket No. 000616179–1190–02] (RIN: 0648–ZA90) received August 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3573. A letter from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundations's final rule—Antarctic Non-Governmental Expeditions (RIN: 3145–AA36) received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3574. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update—received August 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 2646. A bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011; with an amendment (Rept. 107–191 Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2187. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make receipts collected from mineral leasing activities on certain naval oil shale reserves available to cover environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance costs incurred by the United States with respect to the reserves; with an amendment (Rept. 107–202 Pt. 1).

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1900. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide quality prevention programs and accountability programs relating to juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107–203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2187 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on September 7, 2001]

H.R. 2646. Referral to the Committee on International Relations extended for a period ending not later than September 10, 2001.

[Submitted on September 10, 2001]

H.R. 2187. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than September 10, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for appropriate overtime pay for National Weather Service forecasters performing essential services during severe weather events, and to limit Sunday premium pay for employees of the National Weather Service to hours of service actually performed on Sunday; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 2869. A bill to provide certain relief for small businesses from liability under the Comprehension Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, and to amend such Act to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 2870. A bill to extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code is reenacted.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 2871. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2872. A bill to designate the western breakwater for the project for navigation, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut, as the ''Charles Hervey Townshend Breakwater''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 2873. A bill to extend and amend the program entitled Promoting Safe and Stable Families under title IV-B, subpart 2 of the Social Security Act, and to provide new authority to support programs for mentoring children of incarcerated parents; to amend the Foster Care Independent Living program under title IV-E of that Act to provide for educational and training vouchers for youths aging out of foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. HORN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 2874. A bill to make grants to train sexual assault nurse examiners, law enforcement personnel, and first responders in the handling of sexual assault cases, to establish minimum standards for forensic evidence collection kits, to carry out DNA analyses of samples from crime scenes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2875. A bill to provide that the inferior courts of the United States do not have jurisdiction to hear abortion-related cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 2876. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in Harlem, Montana, as the ''Francis Bardanouve United States Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the inherent right of self-defense; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H. Res. 235. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the establishment of a National Words Can Heal Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

190. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 13 memorializing the United States Congress to urge the United States Postal Service to reconsider the issuance of a Purple Heart Stamp to honor those veterans who received the Order of the Purple Heart for Military Merit defending their country during times of conflict; to the Committee on Government Reform.

191. Also,a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 164 memorializing the United States Congress and the governor of Louisana and the Texas Legislature to actively support routing I–69 through west DeSoto Parish, Louisana and Shelby County, Texas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

192. Also,a memorial of the Senate of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 01–S 0855 memorializing the United States Congress to amend title ten, United States Codes relating to the compensation of retired military, permitting concurrent receipt of military retired pay and Veterans' Administration compensation, including dependents allowances; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 36: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 75: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 190: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 218: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 239: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. SMITH of new Jersey.
H.R. 303: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 325: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 326: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 394: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 458: Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 536: Mr. KELLER and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 638: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 656: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 668: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 689: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 699: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 709: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 746: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 751: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 803: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 808: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 826: Mr. HERGER and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 876: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 978: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1032: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1073: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1109: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1136: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 1187: Mr. DEUTSCH and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1198: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1254: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1265: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1296: Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1318: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1377: Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 1436: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BACA, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1506: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1522: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1555: Mr. COOKSEY.
H.R. 1556: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 1602: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 1605: Mr. BOYD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1669: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 1671: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1672: Mr. LEACH and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 1690: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1700: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1703: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1713: Mr. WEINER and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 1723: Mr. BACA and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1749: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1770: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 1786: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1795: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1810: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1896: Ms. SOLIS.
H.R. 1900: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 1935: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1948: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1956: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1979: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1983: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 2081: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2082: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2087: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2088: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 2125: Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 2135: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2136: Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2145: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2166: Mr. FILNER and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2167: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2173: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2227: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 2265: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 2276: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2294: Mr. COYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 2341: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2352: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2354: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 2357: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 2390: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 2487: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2521: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2531: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 2588: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 2604: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 2609: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 2610: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2612: Mr. SABO and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2619: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2622: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2638: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WELLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2641: Mr. FILNER and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2659: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2663: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2675: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 2688: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2690: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SABO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2718: Mr. HOLT and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2725: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 2765: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 2779: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 2787: Mr. FROST, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2795: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2805: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2806: Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2812: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 2817: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. PENCE and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. FORBES.
H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CANTOR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. GORDON and Mrs. NORTHUP.
H. Con. Res. 177: Mrs. EMERSON.
H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. DOYLE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 191: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FROST.
H. Con. Res. 220: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H. Res. 128: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. GORDON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1983: Mr. SCHROCK.
H.R. 2269: Mr. PASCRELL.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 3 by Mr. TURNER on House Resolution 203: Wayne T. Gilchrest and Maxine Waters.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of subtitle B of title V (page ____, after line ____), insert the following new section:

SEC. 520. PREPARATION FOR, PARTICIPATION IN, AND CONDUCT OF ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS BY THE NATIONAL GUARD AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) EXPANSION OF EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 504 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(3) prepare for and participate in a qualifying athletic competition or a small arms competition.''.

(b) COMPETITIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH TRAINING.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CONDUCT OF AND PARTICIPATION IN COMPETITIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH TRAINING.—(1) Members and units of the National Guard may conduct and compete in a qualifying athletic competition or a small arms competition in conjunction with training required under this chapter in any case in which—

''(A) the conduct of or participation in the competition does not adversely affect the quality of that training or otherwise interfere with the ability of a member or unit of the National Guard to perform the military functions of the member or unit;

''(B) National Guard personnel will enhance their military skills as a result of conducting or participating in the competition; and

''(C) the conduct of or participation in the competition will not result in a significant increase in the cost of the training.

''(2) Facilities and equipment of the National Guard, including military property and vehicles described in section 508(c) of this title, may be used in connection with the conduct of or participation in a qualifying athletic competition or a small arms competition under paragraph (1).''.

(c) OTHER MATTERS.—Such section is further amended by adding after subsection (c), as added by subsection (b) of this section, the following new subsections:

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Subject to such limitations as may be enacted in appropriations Acts, amounts appropriated for the National Guard may be used to cover—

''(1) the costs of conducting or participating in a qualifying athletic competition or a small arms competition under subsection (c); and

''(2) the expenses of members of the National Guard under subsection (a)(3), including expenses of attendance and participation fees, travel, per diem, clothing, equipment, and related expenses.

''(e) QUALIFYING ATHLETIC COMPETITION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'qualifying athletic competition' means a competition in athletic events that require skills relevant to military duties or involve aspects of physical fitness that are evaluated by the armed forces in determining whether a member of the National Guard is fit for military duty.''.

(d) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—'' after ''(a)''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''AUTHORIZED LOCATIONS.—'' after ''(b)''.

(e) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 504. National Guard schools; small arms competitions; athletic competitions''.

(2) The item relating to section 504 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of that title is amended to read as follows:

''504. National Guard schools; small arms competitions; athletic competitions.''.

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of subtitle E of title X (page 307, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION OF FUEL EFFICIENCY REFORMS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government is the largest single energy user in the United States, and the Department of Defense is the largest energy user among all Federal agencies.

(2) The Department of Defense consumed 595,000,000,000,000 BTUs of petroleum in fiscal year 1999, while all other Federal agencies combined consumed 56,000,000,000,000 BTUs of petroleum.

(3) The total cost of petroleum to the Department of Defense amounted to $3,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(4) Increased fuel efficiency would reduce the cost of delivering fuel to military units during operations and training and allow a corresponding percentage of defense dollars to be reallocated to logistic shortages and other readiness needs.

(5) Increased fuel efficiency would decrease the time needed to assemble military units, would increase unit flexibility, and would allow units to remain in the field for a longer period of time.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should work to implement fuel efficiency reforms, as recommended by the Defense Science Board report, which allow for investment decisions based on the true cost of delivered fuel, strengthen the linkage between warfighting capability and fuel logistics requirements, provide high-level leadership encouraging fuel efficiency, target fuel efficiency improvements through science and technology investment, and include fuel efficiency in requirements and acquisition processes.

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of subtitle A of title III (page 46, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND PRESERVATION OF LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL, MARNES LA-COGUETTE, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lafayette Escadrille, an aviation squadron within the French Lafayette Flying Corps, was formed April 16, 1916.

(2) The Lafayette Escadrille consisted of aviators from the United States who volunteered to fight for the people of France during World War I.

(3) 265 volunteers from the United States served in the Lafayette Flying Corps, completing 3,000 combat sorties and amassing nearly 200 victories.

(4) The Lafayette Escadrille won 4 Legions of Honor, 7 Medailles Militaires, and 31 citations, each with a Croix de Guerre.

(5) In 1918, command of the Lafayette Escadrille was transferred to the United States, where the Lafayette Escadrille became the combat air force of the United States.

(6) In 1921, a Franco-American committee was organized to locate a final resting place for the 68 United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I.

(7) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial was dedicated on July 4, 1928, in honor of all United States aviators who flew for France during World War I.

(8) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, located in the United States and in France, was founded by Nelson Cromwell in 1930 and endowed with a $1,500,000 trust for the maintenance and upkeep of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(9) Environmental conditions have contributed to structural damage to, and the overall degradation of, the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, preventing the holding of memorial services inside the crypt.

(10) The French Government has pledged funds to support a restoration of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(11) The United States should continue to honor the sacrifices made by all Americans who have served our Nation and our allies.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Air Force only for the purpose of making a grant to the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, Inc., to be used solely to perform the repair, restoration, and preservation of the structure, plaza, and surrounding grounds of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes La-Coguette, France. The grant funds shall be used solely for costs associated with such repair, restoration, and preservation, and none of the funds may be used for remuneration of any entity or individual associated with fund raising for the project.

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of subtitle A of title III (page 46, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND PRESERVATION OF LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL, MARNES LA-COGUETTE, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lafayette Escadrille, an aviation squadron within the French Lafayette Flying Corps, was formed April 16, 1916.

(2) The Lafayette Escadrille consisted of aviators from the United States who volunteered to fight for the people of France during World War I.

(3) 265 volunteers from the United States served in the Lafayette Flying Corps, completing 3,000 combat sorties and amassing nearly 200 victories.

(4) The Lafayette Escadrille won 4 Legions of Honor, 7 Medailles Militaires, and 31 citations, each with a Croix de Guerre.

(5) In 1918, command of the Lafayette Escadrille was transferred to the United States, where the Lafayette Escadrille became the combat air force of the United States.

(6) In 1921, a Franco-American committee was organized to locate a final resting place for the 68 United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I.

(7) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial was dedicated on July 4, 1928, in honor of all United States aviators who flew for France during World War I.

(8) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, located in the United States and in France, was founded by Nelson Cromwell in 1930 and endowed with a $1,500,000 trust for the maintenance and upkeep of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(9) Environmental conditions have contributed to structural damage to, and the overall degradation of, the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, preventing the holding of memorial services inside the crypt.

(10) The French Government has pledged funds to support a restoration of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(11) The United States should continue to honor the sacrifices made by all Americans who have served our Nation and our allies.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Air Force only for the purpose of making a grant to the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, Inc., to be used solely to perform the repair, restoration, and preservation of the structure, plaza, and surrounding grounds of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes La-Coguette, France. The grant funds shall be used solely for costs associated with such repair, restoration, and preservation, and none of the funds may be used for remuneration of any entity or individual associated with fund raising for the project.

(c) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount provided in section 301(5) for funding the Office of the Secretary of Defense is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of subtitle A of title III (page 46, after line 23), insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. REPAIR, RESTORATION, AND PRESERVATION OF LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL, MARNES LA-COGUETTE, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lafayette Escadrille, an aviation squadron within the French Lafayette Flying Corps, was formed April 16, 1916.

(2) The Lafayette Escadrille consisted of aviators from the United States who volunteered to fight for the people of France during World War I.

(3) 265 volunteers from the United States served in the Lafayette Flying Corps, completing 3,000 combat sorties and amassing nearly 200 victories.

(4) The Lafayette Escadrille won 4 Legions of Honor, 7 Medailles Militaires, and 31 citations, each with a Croix de Guerre.

(5) In 1918, command of the Lafayette Escadrille was transferred to the United States, where the Lafayette Escadrille became the combat air force of the United States.

(6) In 1921, a Franco-American committee was organized to locate a final resting place for the 68 United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I.

(7) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial was dedicated on July 4, 1928, in honor of all United States aviators who flew for France during World War I.

(8) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, located in the United States and in France, was founded by Nelson Cromwell in 1930 and endowed with a $1,500,000 trust for the maintenance and upkeep of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(9) Environmental conditions have contributed to structural damage to, and the overall degradation of, the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, preventing the holding of memorial services inside the crypt.

(10) The French Government has pledged funds to support a restoration of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(11) The United States should continue to honor the sacrifices made by all Americans who have served our Nation and our allies.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Air Force only for the purpose of making a grant to the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, Inc., to be used solely to perform the repair, restoration, and preservation of the structure, plaza, and surrounding grounds of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes La-Coguette, France. The grant funds shall be used solely for costs associated with such repair, restoration, and preservation, and none of the funds may be used for remuneration of any entity or individual associated with fund raising for the project.

(c) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount provided in section 301(5) for funding the Washington Headquarters Services is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of subtitle E of title X (page 307, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CONTINUED UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO RESTORING LAFAYETTE ESCADRILLE MEMORIAL, MARNES LA-COGUETTE, FRANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Lafayette Escadrille, an aviation squadron within the French Lafayette Flying Corps, was formed April 16, 1916.

(2) The Lafayette Escadrille consisted of aviators from the United States who volunteered to fight for the people of France during World War I.

(3) 265 volunteers from the United States served in the Lafayette Flying Corps, completing 3,000 combat sorties and amassing nearly 200 victories.

(4) The Lafayette Escadrille won 4 Legions of Honor, 7 Medailles Militaires, and 31 citations, each with a Croix de Guerre.

(5) In 1918, command of the Lafayette Escadrille was transferred to the United States, where the Lafayette Escadrille became the combat air force of the United States.

(6) In 1921, a Franco-American committee was organized to locate a final resting place for the 68 United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I.

(7) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial was dedicated on July 4, 1928, in honor of all United States aviators who flew for France during World War I.

(8) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial Foundation, located in the United States and in France, was founded by Nelson Cromwell in 1930 and endowed with a $1,500,000 trust for the maintenance and upkeep of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(9) Environmental conditions have contributed to structural damage to, and the overall degradation of, the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, preventing the holding of memorial services inside the crypt.

(10) The French Government has pledged funds to support a restoration of the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

(11) The Lafayette Escadrille Memorial should be restored to its original beauty to honor all the United States aviators who flew for France during World War I and to demonstrate the respect of the United States for the sacrifices made by all Americans who have served our Nation and our allies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to honor its commitment to the United States aviators who lost their lives flying for France during World War I by appropriating sufficient funds to restore the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial in Marnes La-Coguette, France.